INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 6. (NEW SERIES.) JUNE, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus"	161
The Royal Commission on Expenditure	166
Lord Brassey and Others	167
"A Fighter Ever"	169
Anglo-Indians and the Congress	171
OUR LONDON LETTER	173
British Policy in India	175
Dinner to the President of the Congress	175
CORRESPONDENCE: The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure	176
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	176
NOTES ON THE INDIAN BUDGET, by A. J. Wilson	177
THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE, by H. N. Haridas	179
THE HOME CHARGES AND THE ROYAL COMMISSION, by T. Lloyd	180
Indian Trade and Trade in India, III	182
India and the National Reform Union	184
India and British Constituencies: Important Meeting in Manchester	185
Anglo-Indians and the Opium Commission	188
REVIEWS: Indian Scenes	190
"Chips," Linguistic and Literary	191

Indiana.

Is it not high time that the Parliamentary opponents of the "forward" frontier policy took steps to secure in the House of Commons a discussion of the Government's intentions in regard to Chitral? Such questions as have been put have been met with evasive answers—the Government, we are told, has not yet determined what policy it will pursue; or the matter is at present under its most earnest consideration. The danger is, as previous incidents of the same kind only too plainly show, that this sort of evasion may have the effect of postponing discussion until discussion becomes useless. One has only to piece together the scraps of news which come from Chitral in order to see how great this danger is. On May 9th, for example, it was reported from Simla that the Government of India was "in possession of the views of nearly every military and civil officer in the service of the State entitled to speak with authority upon the question of the future of Chitral."

> So far (the telegram continued) the majority of the experts are of opinion that the action of the Imperial authorities in the future should be confined to the keeping open of a good military road from the Swat frontier to Chitral. The others favour a British occupation, temporarily at any rate.

Then, on May 12th, it was announced from Kala Drosh that by the directions of General Stedman the various camps along the route from Dargai to Kala Drosh would forthwith move on to high ground. "This," the correspondent added, "is considered additional proof that we are to pass the summer, at any rate, in this country." At the same time the correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed from Simla that "the balance of opinion in India is undoubtedly in favour of opening up the new route." On May 14th a Reuter's telegram stated that the telegraph line had been carried to within twenty miles of Chitral. On May 16th the special correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed from Munda camp that all available labourers had been hired for the work of road-making. He added significantly:—

> When the main line to Chitral is thoroughly established and the forts stored and permanently garrisoned, it will probably become imperative to root out thoroughly all disaffected elements in Whandul and the adjacent territories by an armed force.

Finally, the correspondent of the *Times* at Chitral telegraphed on May 18th that "a site has been selected for a new fort in case the Government decides to hold Chitral."

I submit that this information furnishes ample ground for action in the House of Commons. If discussion is not brought on without further delay, the case will, it is reasonable to fear, be decided by default in favour of the "spreadeagle" school. It is surprising that Liberal newspapers in London have not taken up the subject with greater vigour, but nothing could be better than the leading articles in which the *Manchester Guardian* has deprecated the "forward" policy. The *Saturday Review* for May 18th contained a notable article from General Sir Neville Chamberlain in continuation of his letters to the *Times*. No one, he admits, can question the power

of the Government to subdue the independent tribesmen, but, after this generous task had been performed, there would remain the necessity for maintaining their subjugation. The question is not whether it can be done, but whether it is expedient to do it. Sir Neville Chamberlain concludes with a practical suggestion:

"It was in violation of military principles that Chitral was originally occupied by a small British garrison. It was six hundred miles from the British frontier, it was not accessible at all times of the year, and at the best of seasons was only to be reached by threading barren defiles devoid of supplies for man or beast. A new route of two hundred miles, again beyond the British border, is now, with all its prospective difficulties, a prescribed remedy for past faults; and if Chitral is to remain a British outpost, that line of communication becomes a necessity. However, as our statesmen have on two occasions thought it wise to withdraw our forces from Afghanistan is it not now possible—without loss of prestige—to make over Chitral and its inhabitants to the safe custody of the Amir of Cabul? That sovereign is already the custodian of hundreds of miles of the frontier which separates Afghanistan from Central Asia, and he can therefore be trusted in his own interests, as well as in those of England, to keep watch and ward over an additional Pass leading from the desolate region of the Pamirs."

One thing is certain. If the present Liberal Government lends its support to the costly, futile, and dangerous "forward" policy, it will pay a heavy penalty in the constituencies. It is now recognised in the United Kingdom, as it has never been before, that the fatuous policy of trans-frontier aggression and annexation lies at the root of the financial difficulties of India.

A military correspondent, whose authority on this subject is second to none, writes to me:—The original occupation of Chitral has led us in my opinion into a series of political blunders, and into what Mr. Gladstone once termed "blood-guiltiness." The independent tribesmen beyond the Peshawur borders are not our subjects. We have never claimed the right to rule them. They gave us no cause to chastise them, and we and they were at peace. We are the aggressors, and devoid of provocation. The Government occupies an entirely false and unjustifiable position in those valleys. The tribesmen must suffer, and the more bravely they defend their independence the greater will be their loss and their misery. The weak must and will go to the wall as far as the present is concerned. The loss of life on our side is lamentable; the loss on the other side tantamount to criminal. And with all these considerations beyond dispute, everybody admits the desirability of cultivating amicable relations with Afghanistan and the tribesmen beyond our borders. In a lecture delivered by Mr. Curzon that traveller has told us how hostile the tribes of Afghanistan are to the English nation because of the thousands of their countrymen and co-religionists killed by us during the two Afghan wars.

I is instructive to observe how wanton destruction of life in one place is employed to destruction of life in another place. *Pall Mall Gazette* of these latter day Special Commissioner to Turkey to enqu at any rate, to write about the Armenian His first article contained this passage:

"Misdated and anonymous telegrams, telling of bare, homes, where late the sweet Armenians sung, of slaugh supererogation, of murder stalking and rape at large—an this heaped horror just because the saintly Armenians w shipped Christ as we do—these terrible tales had come at la to make fifty Englishmen laugh loud at the lie of it all, an the other fifty fret and fever their poor little middle-class miseducated souls into a frenzy of fanaticism and self-righteousness. They forgot, these latter, that, up to the hour that is, we had won and governed India by the sword alone. They forgot that wherever we holy English thought it desirable for our own purposes, we had ever killed deliberately, extensively, and without doubt *most rightly*. They did not notice that deaths by bayonet-wounds were rife about Chitral, and that many Chitrali villages followed the all-fresh example of the Burmese, and so went up in fire."

Do Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India like the parallel?

It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of the meeting which was held at Manchester on May 1st to consider the Civil and Military Expenditure of the Government of India. The meeting was summoned by the National Reform Union, and the speakers included Mr. Philip Stanhope, M.P., Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P. The audience, it is true, was not very large, but it was representative and influential, and it listened with profound interest and attention to the advocates of Indian reform. Some of my Indian readers may not know that the National Reform Union is a political organisation devoted to the advocacy of Liberal policy throughout the United Kingdom. Its motto is "peace, retrenchment and reform." It has branches in many hundreds of constituencies and by means of lectures and leaflets it accomplishes an immense amount of political work of an educational kind. A member of the Union explains in an article that appears in another column the circumstances under which this important organisation has now incorporated the problems of Indian reform in its regular programme. The Manchester meeting was summoned on account of "the importance of this subject to Lancashire, emphasised as it has been by the recent imposition of import duties on cotton." But the activity of the National Reform Union is by no means confined to Lancashire. Through its influence, and its co-operation, for which thanks are specially due to Mr. A. G. Symonds, the Secretary of the Union, the problems of Indian reform promise to receive new attention at the hands of speakers and lecturers in all parts of the country.

The immediate value of the Manchester meeting

consists chiefly in the fact that almost every person who was present was a delegate from a political association. In other words, almost every individual in an audience numbering some hundreds will since then have been the nucleus of many informal meetings elsewhere. The occasion was most opportune. Rarely have Indian questions held so prominent a place in the thoughts of the average British elector as they hold at present. The re-imposition of the import duties on cottons excited an interest which was strengthened and deepened by the signal object-lesson in trans-frontier aggression in Chitral, and which has since been reinforced by the Report of the Opium Commission and the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into Indian expenditure. We may hope that this newly aroused interest may not prove evanescent, and that British electors will be led to look beyond telegrams and despatches to the underlying errors of policy which are responsible for the disordered condition of Indian finance. Undoubtedly Indian questions will be to the fore at the next general election. Not only will every Liberal candidate in Lancashire be called upon, whether he wishes or not, to discuss the import duties, but in other constituencies also there is an increasing disposition to have regard to the claims of the Indian people. Mr. A. E. Fletcher, for example, the Liberal candidate for Greenock, and the late editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, has included in his election address a reference to Indian affairs, and he intends, I believe, to keep the Indian problem to the front throughout his campaign.

A report of the speeches delivered at Manchester will be found on another page. Their purpose was to insist, above all else, that the cause of financial embarrassment in India, and therefore of the re-imposition of the cotton duties, is to be found not, as some Anglo-Indian officials would have us believe, in the fall of the exchange-value of the rupee, but in spendthrift policy. That policy will have to be changed, and the power which can bring about the change is the power of the constituencies of the United Kingdom. The resolution, which was unanimously carried, put the matter in a nutshell:—

> "That this meeting, being convinced that the imposition of cotton duties in India is mainly due to excessive and increasing military expenditure beyond the frontier, urges Lancashire representatives in Parliament to strictly scrutinise this expenditure, and to press upon the Government the maintenance of a a frontier policy which will secure the safety of the Indian Empire while economising the resources and giving contentment to the people of India."

Lancashire representatives will have excellent opportunities of giving effect to the spirit of this resolution when the question of the Government's future policy in regard to Chitral comes before the House of Commons, and when the Indian Budget comes up for discussion.

The *Pioneer* in its issue of April 2nd last, referring to an article which appeared in INDIA for the previous month, entitled "The War in Waziristan," charges its author with having dealt with the subject dishonestly on two specific points. It says:

> "INDIA begins by asserting that, at the Kabul Conference in 1893, a secret agreement was concluded with the Amír, under which the south-eastern boundary of his kingdom was to be marked. The truth, as everyone should know by this time, was that there was no secrecy at all in the agreement. Its terms were read in public durbar at Kabul, and were made known by the Government of India immediately afterwards."

We still maintain, however, that the agreement was secret, since only some of its provisions were mentioned in newspapers in India, and its text was kept, and is still being kept, strictly concealed from the public. Indeed the Government has persistently refused to state in Parliament even the heads of the agreement. In view of these facts, we may leave our readers to form their own judgment on the question of truth and honesty which has been raised by the *Pioneer*.

The other passage in our article to which the *Pioneer* took exception runs thus:

> "The tribal hostility in Waziristan being unabated, a British force entered the country in the last days of October, and was so severely attacked on the 3rd November at Wano that it was disabled from advancing further during the remainder of the year."

"This," says the *Pioneer*, "is garbled history with a vengeance;" and it proceeds to offer the following explanations in support of the charge:

> "So far from sending a punitive expedition into Waziristan in October, the Government of India attempted to solve the Mahsud question by peaceful means. Our Boundary Commissioner was, it is true, given an escort; but it was not of a strength which could justify more than simple defence of the camp, and its presence in Wano was merely to guard the officers who had to demarcate the border. . . . . To speak of the British force as being unable to advance further after the Wano affair would give the impression that the troops were engaged in a punitive expedition. On the contrary, they were forbidden to enter the Mahsud territory at all, and they obeyed their instructions."

Now these explanations are at variance with the following statement which the *Pioneer* published on the 12th September last, when the Government of India was preparing to invade Waziristan in order to coerce the tribes to submit to British authority:

> "Waziristan was declared last November by the Amír to be within the scope of British influence, and the frontier was marked. The line swept well west of the Waziri country, taking in Wano and trending away northwards. . . . . The British Demarcation Commissioner shall have an escort equal to repelling an attack in force. The Mahsuds must be coerced. With the Reserve brigade, 5,000 men will be more than enough to deal with the Waziris. Early in October our troops must move through the Gomal. There is something more than simple demarcation to be done in Waziristan. The Mahsuds have to be reduced to good order, and the task must be undertaken forthwith."

After this our readers will probably think with us

that the term "garbled history" applies rather to the version of the affair given in the *Pioneer* of 2nd April, which not only varies from the *Pioneer's* previous statement, but actually contains two assertions that are irreconcilable with each other—namely, that the British force was sent to "guard the officers who had to demarcate the border" (an operation which necessitated their traversing the Mahsud territory) and that the troops in question "were forbidden to enter the Mahsud territory."

Special attention is invited to an article, published in the present issue of INDIA, in which Mr. A. J. Wilson discusses the Indian Budget. Mr. Wilson, who is a financier of experience and distinction, expresses the opinion that the system upon which the Government of India at present issues its accounts is "indefensible except on the ground that it enables the Executive to hide what it is doing." The external form is bad enough, but the internal arrangement of the accounts is worse. The result is that criticism is not only rendered difficult but is also liable to the official rejoinder that it is based upon a misinterpretation of the accounts. This is precisely what happened in the case of the Note which was drawn up by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress on the Indian Budget of last year. "What they [the British Committee] wished to prove," said Sir J. Westland last March, "was that expenditure had increased from other causes than exchange; what they actually did was to pick out the figures which are placed in the column of exchange in the Annual Statement of Accounts and, deducting them, to compare the others. . . . . The fall of the rupee, however, directly increases our expenditure under many other items." As a matter of fact, the British Committee avoided the pitfall to which Sir J. Westland refers; but what, in the name of common sense, is the use of setting apart a column for cost of exchange if its contents do not show the total cost of exchange? Sir J. Westland's rejoinder to the British Committee is, as will be pointed out in a second "Note" which will shortly be issued upon the Budget for the present year, "a severe if unintentional condemnation of the methods adopted by the Government of India in presenting their accounts." Indeed, Sir James Westland himself appears, on a previous occasion, to have committed the "gigantic blunder" which he charges to the British Committee. If Mr. Fowler, before he leaves the India Office, were to insist upon clearer and more manageable accounts, it would not be true to say that he had done nothing to promote Indian reform.

The Report of the Opium Commission was a foregone conclusion. It was not to be expected that such a Commission, supplied with such evidence, would arrive at any other verdict than that which is before us. At the same time it is inaccurate to say that Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., stands alone among his colleagues in the conclusions which he has published in his minority report. On the contrary, the two Indian members of the Commission, the Máháràja of Darbhanga and Mr. Haridas Viharidas agree with him in certain important particulars (for example, in regard to the total prohibition of opium-smoking), although they have signed the majority report. So far as public opinion in India is concerned, its hostility to the Commission may be said to have ended when the people of India were relieved of the unjust burden of the cost of the Commission. The circumstances under which the Commission was appointed appear to be overlooked by some of its critics. The "Anti-Opiumists," as they are called, are commonly represented as having moved for its appointment. They did nothing of the kind. On April 10th, 1891, a motion was proposed by Sir Joseph Pease, and carried in the House of Commons, to the effect that the system by which the Indian opium revenue was raised was morally indefensible. On June 3rd, 1893, Mr. Alfred Webb, following up that resolution, proposed that a Royal Commission should be appointed

> "to enquire both in India and in this country, and to report as to (i) what retrenchments and reforms can be effected in the military and civil expenditure of India; (ii) by what means Indian resources can be best developed; and (iii) what, if any, temporary assistance from the British Exchequer would be required in order to meet any deficit of revenue which would be occasioned by the suppression of the opium traffic."

Mr. Webb's resolution expressly recognised that the people of India ought not to be called upon to bear the cost involved in this change of policy. The Commission which he proposed would have been really useful, and would have anticipated the Commission which has just been appointed to enquire into Indian expenditure.

But Mr. Webb's resolution was not carried. What was carried, against the votes of the "anti-opiumists," was a resolution of Mr. Gladstone's, proposing the appointment of a Commission to report, *inter alia*, as to whether the growth of the poppy and the manufacture and sale of opium in British India should be prohibited except for medical purposes. Mr. Gladstone's cleverness was superlative, but it is not fair to attribute to the "anti-opiumists" something against which they protested in the division-lobby. Mr. Webb's proposal had the merit of considering the financial question by itself. In the enquiries of Mr. Gladstone's Commission financial and moral questions have been

confused, somewhat to the disadvantage of the latter. Moreover, its enquires were limited to India where the effects of the traffic in opium have never been seriously attacked. It is in China, where the prevalent habit is opium-smoking, that the critics of the traffic find their chief ground for complaint.

The questions submitted to the Commission, and the answers of the two reports, may be briefly summarised as follows:—

(i) Whether opium should be prohibited except for medical purposes.
The majority reply No.
Mr. Wilson replies Yes.

(ii) Whether prohibition could be extended to the Native States.
The majority reply No.
Mr. Wilson also replies No, but urges that example and influence should be employed.

(iii) Whether the transit of opium from the Native States through British territory could be justly terminated.
The majority reply No.
Mr. Wilson replies, Yes when the British Indian traffic with China is terminated.

(iv) As to the effect of prohibition of opium on the finances of India.
The majority reply that the finances are not in a condition to bear charges for compensation, preventive measures, and loss of revenue.
Mr. Wilson says that there is no precedent for compensation to cultivators; that the information as to preventive measures was scanty; and that, generally, statements appeared to be greatly exaggerated. He remarks that the opium revenue has been declining and cannot be relied upon.

(v) Whether any change short of prohibition should be made in the present system.
The majority reply that the present regulations might be amended; that the "Bengal Monopoly" is the best system of production; and that Burma should be left alone for the present.
Mr. Wilson recommends that the sale should be restricted to official vendors with instructions to restrict the sale, and that smoking should be absolutely prohibited.

(vi) As to the consumption of opium and its effects on the people.
The majority report that there is no evidence of widespread moral or physical degradation through the use of opium; that it is widely used for medical and quasi-medical purposes, in some cases with benefit and for the most part without serious consequences; that it is not practicable to distinguish between medical and non-medical uses; and that the habitual use as a stimulant by young people is generally condemned.
Mr. Wilson observes that little evidence was tendered from the districts where least opium is consumed; that the habit is relatively exceptional in British India; and that the moral and physical effect is injurious.

(vii) As to the disposition of the people in regard to the use of opium.
The majority give no concise reply.
Mr. Wilson says:—"The people of India do not, so far as regards the greater part of that country, regard the use of opium for non-medical purposes favourably."

Elsewhere in this issue will be found Mr. Wilson's memorandum on the attitude of the authorities in India towards the Commission. Its contents should serve as a timely warning to the members of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.

In the House of Commons on May 24th Sir Joseph Pease moved an important resolution on the subject of the opium traffic. He reminded the House of its resolution of June 1893, which urged the Government of India to "continue their policy of greatly diminishing the cultivation of the poppy and the production and sale of opium," and he invited honourable members to agree that "the system by which the Indian opium revenue is raised is morally indefensible," and to "urge upon the Indian Government that they should cease to grant licenses for the cultivation of the poppy and sale of opium in British India, except to supply the legitimate demand for medical purposes." Mr. John Ellis seconded the resolution, and it was also supported by Mr. H. J. Wilson. It was ultimately negatived by 117 votes, 59 members voting for it and 176 against it. The debate, which will be fully reported in the next number of INDIA, was chiefly remarkable for the truculence of Mr. Fowler. Those who heard his speech are agreed that he surpassed himself in the vehemence with which he denounced "anti-opiumist" members of his own party. Mr. Fowler, throughout his Parliamentary career, has been conspicuous for anxiety to be on good terms with his political opponents. The *Daily News* has written of him:—

> "Mr. Fowler likes pleasing people as much as Mr. Chamberlain likes annoying them; and that is saying a good deal. Of course this virtue, like others, has its corresponding vice or defect. There are occasions when a man ought not care what the enemy think of him; there are even some when he should be indifferent to the opinion of his friends. Mr. Fowler will never initiate a great policy or lead a forlorn hope."

If Mr. Fowler has not yet learned to suspect the almost frantic enthusiasm with which his speeches on Indian affairs are greeted on the Opposition benches, he ought to have received a warning from the ominous silence which he produces on the Liberal side of the House. He is too apt to treat his Liberal critics as if they were utterly devoid alike of the logical faculty and of moral sense. Opinions undoubtedly differ as to the expediency of the course which the "anti-opiumists" recommend, but the excellence of their intentions is above suspicion. Mr Fowler, however, gave them no credit for disinterestedness and he received, as usual, cordial eulogies from the Tory press.

Professor Murison in his speech at the dinner at which, on May 4th, Mr. Alfred Webb was entertained by his Indian friends residing in Great Britain, referred to "the extraordinary gratitude with which Indians receive the slightest attention." It is a pity that Anglo-Indians, as a class, are not more eager to win this easy and abundant return But the faith of Indians remains nevertheless un-

shaken. To hear the speeches on the interesting occasion which I have mentioned, and to mark their effect upon their Indian hearers, was to receive two commanding impressions—impressions, that is, of the abiding conviction among Indians that Englishmen will redress a wrong if it is really made known to them; and of the yearning of these cordial, courteous, intelligent men for "equality." The word was invariably applauded. The gratitude which they expressed for the benefits of British rule found its counterpart in a strong claim for more effective representation. They expect great things of the House of Commons. Let us hope that their expectations may not be disappointed. Meantime, as Mr. H. J. Wilson reminded his audience of young Indians, it is their duty to turn to the best account such local representative institutions as already exist. The ignorance of the average Englishman concerning Indian affairs was amusingly illustrated by Mr. Webb who was received, as he always is, with unbounded cordiality. It appears that when he returned to London from the sittings of the Indian National Congress he was asked how he understood the language. More than one Muhammadan speaker at the dinner exposed for the hundredth time the fatuity of those amateurs of the "Divide and Rule" policy who would fain believe, and persuade others, that the Congress consists solely of Hindus.

All who have had a share in producing the *Madras Review* are to be congratulated upon the excellence of its first number. It is edited by Mr. C. Sankaran Nair, member of the Madras Legislative Council and Fellow of Madras University. The first number, dated May, 1895, contains among other contributions a notable article by Mr. John Adam, who recently returned from London to Madras, on the Duties of Indian Citizens. There is, he thinks, plenty of talk and plenty of public agitation in India, but "these are very different affairs from the daily round of working citizenship, pursued without hope of profit or even, for the most part, of applause." To know and understand the history, the institutions, and the government of the country; to take greater and more continuous interest in the conduct of municipal and local affairs; to promote education and to support and improve the indigenous press—these are the activities which Mr. Adam regards as the paramount duties of citizenship. He will have done a good work for India if he succeeds in diffusing among its people something of that new zeal for the teaching and the learning of civic duty which men like Mr. Acland and Mr. Bryce have lately done so much to arouse in the United Kingdom. Mr. Adam's observations on Indian newspapers are candid and to the point. They are, he submits, too little like newspapers and too much like weekly philosophic reviews. Hence they tend to be merely supplementary to Anglo-Indian journals in the hands only of those who can buy many papers. Mr. Adam criticises "laxity of supervision on the part of many editors," and expresses surprise that none of the Indians who come to England thinks of training himself for the business of journalism. "It is business capacity, good reporting, attractive presentment of news, and accuracy in detail that are wanted." The *Madras Review* does not profess to be a newspaper, but it promises to be a valuable addition to the "indigenous press" of India.

FIDUS.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON EXPENDITURE.

IT has been said of an American University that the students direct the studies and the faculty directs the sports. It might, without great inaccuracy, be said of our present system of governing India that a clique of civil servants directs the policy while Parliament directs nothing. The terms of the reference to the Royal Commission which has at last been appointed come, not from the House of Commons, but from its servants. The Commission is to enquire into "the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India, "and into the apportionment of charge between "the Governments of the United Kingdom and of "India." Needless to say, it was not for any such limited enquiry as this that the Indian Parliamentary Committee asked before the debate on the Indian Budget last August. Mr. Samuel Smith and his friends, whom the people of India have to thank for the appointment of any Commission at all, asked for full and independent enquiry into the condition of the people of India, their ability to bear their present burdens, the possibilities of reduction in the expenditure, and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom generally. In other words, the Parliamentary advocates of Indian reform requested a general "stocktaking" of the kind which was periodic under the rule of the East India Company, and, as we have shown in these columns, had the effect of conferring upon our Indian fellow-subjects some of the greatest boons that they have received. Mr. Fowler used to have the reputation of an acute financier. But since he went to the India Office he has apparently developed, or learned, the notion that it is not necessary to ascertain the amount of a people's revenues in order to decide what they may wisely spend. He offered, in his speech in reply to Mr. Samuel Smith's motion, to move for the appointment of a Select Committee on Indian Expenditure. The offer was unsatisfactory

enough. But a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee must be approved by the House of Commons, and there was at any rate some ground for hoping that the terms of reference might be extended after further debate. That debate has, however, been avoided by the substitution, at the eleventh hour, of a Royal Commission for a Select Committee. The terms of the reference and the composition of the Commission have been determined without any possibility of intervention on the part of the House of Commons. Mr. Fowler must have forgotten his repeated statements to the effect that subsequent opportunities of discussion would arise. Recent events in Chitral have excited so much interest in the House of Commons that such a discussion would in all probability have led to some practical result. It would have been better for India, although it might have been more inconvenient to the India Office, if the terms of the reference to the Commission had been so extended as to include, for example, enquiry into "the present "condition of the Indian finances." As it is, the India Office has had its way. It has selected its own ground and, we must add, its own time. Amateurs of conundrums may ask, if it takes a Royal Commission nine months to be appointed, how long will it take to report? In order to avoid paralysis, it may be well to pursue the method of *interim* reporting on the several organic sections of the subject-matter.

Mr. Fowler has from the first held to the resolve that questions of policy shall be excluded from the deliberations of his Commission. But policy is a vague term. Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji have never contended that the fundamental principles of Imperial policy can fitly be submitted for revision at the hands of Royal Commissioners. What they have contended is that, between questions of high Imperial policy on one side and questions of mere book-keeping on the other, there is a large middle ground which Parliamentary enquiry might safely and usefully traverse. It was not the Queen's Proclamation nor the Act for the better government of India which ordered the recent invasion of Chitral by British Indian troops. Aggressive military operations in the inhospitable regions of the Hindu Kush are defended, by the handful of persons who believe in them, as a means to an end. The end in view is the defence of the North-West frontier. But this particular means may be, and undoubtedly the majority of competent judges believe it to be, not only useless but positively dangerous. Why should not a Royal Commission collect and examine the considerations which make for and against an individual theory approved only by a small clique of Anglo-Indian officials? What is true in this sense of military policy is to a great extent true also of other departments of Indian administration. Assuming the ends to be fixed and determined, we may nevertheless scrutinise jealously the cost and the value of the means adopted to gain those ends. Sooner or later, we may depend upon it, this task of investigation will have to be performed. Enquiry is wanted not so much into the way in which the Finance Department of the Government of India does its work, as into the way in which it is over-ridden by other Departments. It is common to speak of Anglo-Indian "authorities," or "officials," as a single whole. The term suggests a fallacy. All Anglo-Indians by no means approve the same methods or sets of methods. On the contrary—as in the case of the "forward" frontier policy, for example—a small but powerful section of officers at Simla is really baffling and disheartening saner colleagues who bear the burden and heat of the day. Experts like Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour wash their hands of the precious schemes which have brought the Government of India to the verge of bankruptcy. It remains to see how much of the truth can be brought to light by that part of the Commission's enquiries which will have to do with the "management" of Indian expenditure. The authors of the terms of the reference evidently assume that "administration" and "management" are not one and the same thing. The combination of civil with military expenditure is perhaps rather misleading. If military expenditure in India needs to be reduced, civil expenditure needs to be increased. Among the many calamities for which the "forward" military school is responsible, few are greater than the postponement of urgently needed public works which its futile extravagance has brought about. Enquiry into the "apportion-"ment of charge" between India and the United Kingdom will probably prove the most fruitful work of the Commission. There is a plentiful sprinkling of War Office clerks among Lord Welby's colleagues, but even they will find it difficult to show that India is not at present grievously overcharged.

LORD BRASSEY AND OTHERS.

Lord Brassey is an observant traveller who knows the British Empire as perhaps no other man knows it. He is a man of business and a politician with ideals. He has spoken and written much during many years upon the broader issues of Imperial statesmanship and left upon the mind even of casual readers a general impression of wide information and sound judgment. A collection of his papers and addresses in book form promised to be a work of interest and value. The volume[1] before us is a

[1] Papers and Addresses by Lord Brassey, K.C.B., D.C.L. "Imperial Federation and Colonisation, from 1880 to 1894." Arranged and edited by A. H. Loring and R. J. Beadon, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

disappointment. This is not the fault of Lord Brassey, unless it is a fault to be too good-natured. He has allowed two of the officers of the defunct Imperial Federation League to use his name as at once a cloak and an advertisement for a tedious obituary notice of that rather futile organisation. There are, of course, "papers and addresses" by Lord Brassey incorporated in the volume, but they occupy less than half the pages, and even this proportion is only obtained by inserting verbatim among the "addresses" many trivial little formal speeches and small letters to the press among the "papers." The more important contributions contain an amount of repetition which was inevitable in speeches mainly of a missionary character, delivered all upon the same subject before different audiences, but this is the fault of the editor, whose first duty to the author he was placing before the public was to select or condense his material. There are about five and twenty "papers and addresses" by Lord Brassey in this volume occupying about 160 pages. It is not too much to say that they might well have been cut down to one quarter of the number and to one half the space. No doubt this curtailment would have been made if the real purpose of the book had been that which is to be presumed from the title-page. Under those circumstances also the chronicles and the wisdom of Messrs. Loring and Beadon which, printed in the same type and inextricably co fused with the work of Lord Brassey, occupy the remaining 160 pages, would have shrunk to a few explanatory footnotes, and a concise introduction. The book is not a monument to Lord Brassey but a monument to the Imperial Federation League, and in the construction of it Lord Brassey has been used as building material.

If one takes the book as it is and reads together the writings of Messrs. Loring and Beadon and Lord Brassey, it tells the story of the rise and fall of the Imperial Federation League and reveals with interesting clearness the causes of the failure of that organisation. After the manner of the proverbial fly on the wheel, the secretary and the editor of the League would apparently have us believe that the British Empire was falling headlong to disintegration and ruin until they took it by the hand. They indulge in some not uncommon misrepresentation of the "Manchester school," and take some credit for slaying the policy they attribute to it and teaching statesmen of all parties a wiser and a nobler ideal. Neither the "Manchester school" nor any other responsible section of public men ever held that "the best interests of the United Kingdom require "that she should be rid of her colonies as quickly "as possible" or "advocated an active policy of "separation." It is true that earnest democratic statesmen, in despair at the misgovernment of the colonies, and of India, by Great Britain have feared that the "best interest" of those dependencies might require that they should "be rid" of the Imperial connexion. But that is very different from saying that it is the interest of Great Britain to be rid of them. The changes which this century has witnessed, the wringing of self-government for the colonies from the dominant class in the mother-country, in the face of discontent and veiled or open rebellion throughout the Empire, did much to remove that fear, and the closer union of all the parts of the Empire which the steamship, the railway and the electric telegraph have brought about, together with the changed attitude of the Imperial Government under the control of an enfranchised democracy, has driven the fear further and further into the background. The brighter prospect dawned a generation before the Imperial Federation League was born, and though a word of warning to Jingo statesmen as to the inherent rights of infant or ancient nations has had to be uttered and may have to be uttered again, the true note of all statesmanship has long been to "cultivate the sentiment of Imperial unity." The underlying problem of fifty years has not been between "Manchesterism" and "patriotism" but between "aristocracy" and "de-"mocracy," between the doctrine that the colonies and dependencies exist for the benefit of England and the doctrine that they have equal and inherent rights to enjoy freedom and to work out their own great future, in unity if possible, but if that is not possible, then in independence. As regards the colonies there is a great and dangerous fallacy in the common metaphor of "mother" country and "infant" colonies. After a time, in every-day life, between individuals, length of years ceases to confer unlimited precedence. That is still more true between nations. Many a father never adequately realises that his son is a man and not a boy. The aristocratic ideal of family life in England sacrifices the children to the parents and the younger branches to the elder throughout all generations. The "Manchester" man has another method. He takes his son into partnership on equal terms as soon as he is of age, and leaves his inheritance equitably apportioned between all his offspring. It is the despised "Manchester" system which is needed between nations of a common stock. It is partnership and equality which bind them all together. The "parent and child" attitude is distinctly mischievous, giving shallow politicians in this country a deflected appreciation of the problem of Imperial Unity. There were, we fear, too many gentlemen of this class trying to pull the strings of the Imperial Federation League.

It is almost needless to say that there is no fault to be found with Lord Brassey in this respect. His addresses in Great Britain and in the colonies are wisely conceived and wisely restrained. They are for the most part mines of statistical and general information, making the different peoples of the empire known to one another, inspiring each with a respect for the other, emphasising the bond of mutual interest, strengthening the ties of friendship and kinship, and always "cultivating the sentiment of unity." Lord Brassey was engaged in this work long before the Imperial Federation League was created. The earliest address in this volume was delivered five years before the League was formed. When that organisation had been started he joined it and became its treasurer, doubtless trusting that he would find through it congenial comradeship with men as well-informed as he was and with views as broad and sane as his own. The editors of this volume, half conciously and half unconsciously, reveal his failure.

They show him deli[...] smaller men, but being constantly pushed forward. They show the gradual divergence between the greater and the smaller minds until at last the inevitable crisis arrived, Lord Brassey and others withdrew their support, and the League collapsed and disappeared. This is not the place in which to appraise the work of the League, to balance the good against the evil, and to say which prevailed. Readers of Messrs. Loring and Beadon's book, although it naturally presents the best possible case for the organisation of which these gentlemen were the able officers, will find much recorded that reveals the danger of attempting to transform a subtle sentiment into a material bond. The book should be read for the moral and the instruction which statesmen and politicians can derive from the ten years' failure of the Imperial Federation League, and the important essays by Lord Brassey may be studied by all who wish to forget the failures of the League and find the problems of a United Empire stated with a splendid sanity.

"A FIGHTER EVER."[1]

The publication of a second and enlarged edition of Mr. Bradlaugh's Speeches recalls some of the most representative scenes and episodes in a strenuous and stormy career. The details of that notable career have only recently been traced by loving hands in a full biography. These speeches, though dealing with some of the largest subjects into which Mr. Bradlaugh threw his energies, are but fragments of his thought and eloquence. He never spoke save with a practical purpose, we are told; and therefore he was never concerned to preserve permanent records of his speeches. Such reports, too, as have been preserved in newspapers appear to be rather incomplete or otherwise unsuitable for a collection like the present. "Most of his fully reported speeches at Northampton, for instance, though incomparably effective for their purpose, deal largely with temporary and personal issues; while most of his great speeches and lectures elsewhere on general questions were either briefly or not at all reported." If, however, the purpose is to illustrate Mr. Bradlaugh's oratory, the fact that speeches deal with issues that are temporary and personal ought not to exclude them. Much of the matter of the speeches in this volume may easily be regarded as temporary, and some of it as personal; yet it would have been a pity to have excluded any part of it. If even the big House of Commons speeches, here reproduced, "give but an imperfect idea of the extraordinary force and fire of his oratory, which was naturally at its highest pitch before large audiences," this must be because Mr. Bradlaugh shares the inevitable fate of all speakers, in being unable to get all the elements of their oratory transmitted to the printed page. It is an affectionate estimate to speak of "his hundreds of great orations," and there may be hundreds that hold Mr. Bradlaugh to have been "the greatest platform speaker of their generation." It is enough to admit the claim that "these collected speeches are not an unworthy memorial of a great speaker"—a memorial that errs on the side of modesty rather than of extravagance.

Mr. Bradlaugh's parliamentary struggle has gone into history. Four speeches delivered by him at the Bar of the House of Commons exhibit with lucidity and vigour the attitude he maintained throughout the contest, and the notes added by Mr. Robertson explain in sufficient fulness the circumstances and bearing of each speech. On every occasion, Mr. Bradlaugh spoke with a simple and earnest eloquence, and in a tone at once conciliatory and dignified. It is no longer necessary to trace the phases of the unhappy struggle. There can be no doubt that Mr. Bradlaugh acted as he did in perfect sincerity of conviction as to his duty to himself and to his constituents. At the same time, it was impossible that he should have obtained a fair hearing, for rancorous prejudice was rampant among his opponents, while some of them disgraced themselves and the House with their reckless misconceptions and gross ignorance of the simple facts of the case on which they were so zealous to adjudicate. The action of the Government itself was distinguished by its oppressiveness. While it gave no facilities to Mr. Hopwood for furthering his Bill to amend the law as to oaths, it pressed Mr. Bradlaugh in respect of the judgment for penalties for illegal voting, and it displayed no desire to curb the malignant offensiveness of the action of some of its supporters in the House. The opposition to Mr. Bradlaugh, and especially the spirit of that opposition as contrasted with his high-minded bearing, naturally prompted the stronger sympathy of fair-thinking men. His majorities at Northampton steadily rose under persecution. The working-men in particular stood by him staunchly. "I have been plunged," he said to the House in 1881, "in litigation fostered by men who had not the courage to put themselves forward. I, a penniless man, should have been ruined, if it had not been that the men in workshop, pit, and factory had enabled me to fight this battle." And, again, in the same speech, while disclaiming the aid of the Liberal party, he testified: "It is only by the help of the people, by the pence of toilers in mine and factory, that I am here to-day, after these five struggles right through thirteen years. I have won my way with them, for I have won their hearts, and now I come to you." At last, in January, 1885, on the assembling of the House, Mr. Speaker Peel, who had not been in office on the first challenge of Mr. Bradlaugh's right to swear, declared that he could not permit any interference with his taking of the oath. On August 9, 1888, Mr. Bradlaugh carried his own Bill legalising affirmation in all cases where an oath had been customary; but he did not live to affirm under it himself in the House of Commons. The vexatious technicalities of antiquated prejudice, when stubbornly challenged, must eventually be swept away by the common sense of the people.

As a member of Parliament, Mr. Bradlaugh gave his best thought and energies to every cause that

[1] "Speeches by Charles Bradlaugh." Second and enlarged edition. Annotated by John M. Robertson. London: A. and H. Bradlaugh Bonner.

seemed to him to make for the enlightenment and the elevation of the people. So far as religious matters were concerned, he imposed on himself, most wisely, a self-denying ordinance. "I am determined," he told the Congress of the National Secular Society in 1880, "that in the House of Commons I will never use my position there against religion." His parliamentary speeches on subjects more intimately affecting the welfare of the masses are by no means adequately represented in this volume. Here, indeed, we have a speech on Market Rights and Tolls (supplemented by Mr. Bradlaugh's evidence on this subject before the Royal Commission under the presidency of Lord Derby), a speech on the Compulsory Cultivation of Waste Lands, and a speech on Perpetual Pensions—all of them ringing democratically true. They make, however, but a very narrow representation; and the speeches on the Affirmation Bill and the Religious Prosecutions Abolition Bill must be taken as of course. There is no utterance, for instance, on the Truck Amendment Act of 1887, though, as Mr. Broadhurst told the Trade Union Congress, "every man, woman, and child who can read knows that the consolidating and amending Truck Bill was Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill." There is, however, an extra-parliamentary speech at Northampton on Capital and Labour, in which Mr. Bradlaugh addresses words of sense and truth to both sides, facing the difficulties of the situation with his accustomed frankness. "I say," he declares "that capital and labour may be reconciled by treating men fairly and reasonably on one side, and by the labourers knitting themselves together in the effort to try and treat others fairly and reasonably too." The difficulty lies in the perception of what is fair and reasonable, through the mists of selfish regard which envelope us so closely. Mr. Bradlaugh claims justice, and enforces self-reliance; and his position is none the less right that it became eventually a little unsatisfactory to some of his more eager working-class friends. A very able speech on Ireland, delivered in New York in 1873, is the fresh addition to the present issue. It is characteristically straightforward and energetic, and statesmanlike in its scope and tone.

There are four speeches devoted to Indian subjects. Into these Mr. Bradlaugh carried his usual breadth of view, energy of combat, and sympathy with the weaker side's claim of justice. In 1883 he explained at Northampton "How we obtained India, how we have ruled it, and how it should be ruled," in broad general lines and in admirable tone. "I want to express my intense regret," he said, "that any question affecting Indian rule should be made a matter of party cry and party politics." Again: "If there are to be competitive examinations for the Civil Service, and I think it wise and right that there should be, then the candidates should be examined in Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras." Once more: "We want to put before the people of India a future in which, if they will be patient, as they have been, they may climb, slowly it may be, but surely, to the fullest right of self-government, in course of time. . . . . They may have to climb slowly and painfully, but that will give them the opportunity of making their way upward all the mo[...] r. Bradlaugh's address to the Indian National Congress at Bombay in 1889—wise words of appreciation, encouragement, and exhortation. "The lesson I read here," he said, in reference to the sneering allegation that there is no Indian nation and therefore no National Congress, "the lesson I read here is, that this Congress movement is an educational movement acting as a hammer upon the anvil of millions of human brains, until it welds into one common whole men in whom the consciousness of the need for political and social reforms, and the desire to effect such reforms, are higher than all distinctions of race and creed." Again: "In this movement let there be no force save the force of brain, no secret union—let all be open, frank, and before the law." And again the sober caution: "Do not expect too much, and do not expect it all at once. . . . . Do not be disappointed if of the largest claims only something is conceded. If not just now, it shall be on a day that is to come." Regarding the other two speeches—on the Famine Insurance Fund and on the case of the Máháràja of Kashmir—Mr. Robertson tells us they "were so effective even under the chilling circumstances of an Indian debate in the House of Commons that each in the end carried its point, the Insurance Fund being ultimately restored and the Máháràja finally reinstated." The friends of reasonable reforms in India will regard these Indian speeches with kindly interest and gratitude as memorials of a sincere and active friendliness.

The final group consists of ten closing addresses at Congresses of the National Secular Society in various large towns of England and Scotland in the years 1879-1888. The retrospects and prospects are full of fight and iconoclasm, thoroughly characteristic of the speaker. At the same time the womanly tenderness of the veteran campaigner is frequently unveiled, especially where he feels bound to acknowledge a personal kindness, or even just consideration. Thus, from time to time, glimpses of his life of struggle are opened up suddenly and interestingly. Apart from the truculence of religious warfare, there is much sound doctrine in these addresses, and it is judiciously and firmly enforced. Thus: "We affirm that in no country ought thought on matters of religion to be hindered by penal laws. We declare that in every country religious disabilities should be swept away." Again: "Humanity is growing larger than castles, larger than temples, larger than empires, larger than creeds, larger than churches; men once built these, now they are outgrowing them. I have faith in that Humanity." Faithful to conviction, Mr. Bradlaugh acted up to his motto, "Thorough." He smote his enemy with all his might. "We are a fighting party," he said in 1883; "we are fighting for our existence; our platform is not yet free." He was perfectly, even keenly, aware of the hardness of his blows. "I have said many a bitter word and many a harsh thing," he said in that same speech of 1883; "perhaps some had been better not said." The fierce carriage seems to be against the natural grain. "Yet," he continues, "were I to live my life again, with the knowledge of how cruel, how merciless the Church has been, how it has made speech impossi-

ble, how it has poisoned our lives, I might wonder that all my language had not been bitter instead of only some." For a just judgment of Mr. Bradlaugh's action it is necessary to get to the right standpoint of his experience of life and his reading of history. In any case, he was a man of just, earnest, and fearless character, more staunch for principle than careful of worldly position or life itself. And in view of the essential elements of his personality, large allowance will be made for his incompleteness of thought and his mistakes in action, when he comes to be summed up at the tribunal of history.

ANGLO-INDIANS AND THE CONGRESS.

(FROM A GORAKHPUR CORRESPONDENT.)

The Indian National Congress has now been ten years in existence, but it may be doubted whether the bulk of Anglo-Indians have formed anything like a fair estimate of the origin, the consitution, and the aims of the movement. They hold, naturally enough, that they govern India well. Moreover, that there is a possibility of any defect having crept into their system of administration, it would be heresy on their part to admit or avow. They seem to be mentally incapacitated from grasping the fact that any improvement is possible, or that a movement which has for its object the suggestion of certain reforms can deserve anything but censure. Their censure resolves itself into three main charges: (i) That the Indian National Congress is a Babu Congress; (ii) that it is composed partly of disappointed and impecunious pleaders, and partly of youths who, having received an English education, are cast adrift upon the world; and (iii) that its proposals are utterly impracticable.

(i) We are told that it is a Babu Congress. Many Anglo-Indians who make this allegation intend merely to show their contempt for the Congress, just as the *Civil and Military Gazette* the other day, referring to a speech delivered by the Hon. Pherozshah Mehta in the Imperial Legislative Council, spoke of him as "Babu Pherozshah Mehta." This sarcasm had not the desired effect upon the distinguished Parsi barrister. In reply he said that he was proud to be called a Babu. Many Anglo-Indians, on the other hand, without intending to imply any discredit, are honestly of the opinion that the Congress is mainly composed of Bengalis, whose sole object is, they say, to indulge in frothy talk. Now, if there were any truth in the allegation that the delegates attending the Congress are chiefly drawn from the Bengali race, the claim of the Congress to be considered a national assembly would certainly have to be surrendered. But the allegation is untrue. The Congress publishes every year an official report of its proceedings, giving, in an appendix, a list of delegates, with reference to whom the following particulars are shown in tabular form: Number; Presidency or Government; Congress circle; Electoral division; Names in full of delegates with honorary titles, scholastic degrees, etc., etc.; Race, religion, denomination, and caste (if any); Occupation and addresses; How and when elected. Indeed, it is stated, on high authority, that the Government so far interests itself in the Congress as to obtain full information about the delegates who attend it. Be this as it may, the last report shows that at the recent Congress, held in Madras, only a comparatively small percentage of the delegates were of the Bengali race. It may be said that this small number is to be accounted for by the fact that the particular Congress was held so far from Bengal. I have, therefore, collected the statistics for the last six years, when the meetings of the National Congress were held in the six most important Provinces of India—viz., Bombay, Bengal, the Central Provinces, the North-West Provinces, the Punjab, and Madras.

Year.	Province.	Total number of Delegates.	Bengalis.	Madrasis.	Per cent. of Bengalis.	Per cent. of Madrasis.
1889	Bombay	1889	162	372	8·5	19·6
1890	Bengal	677	312	55	46·1	8·1
1891	Central Provinces	812	68	78	8·3	9·6
1892	North-West Provinces	625	121	44	19·3	7
1893	Punjab	867	83	33	9·5	3·9
1894	Madras	1163	33	933	2·8	80
	Total	6033	779	1515	13	25

This statement shows that, for the six years ending 1894, the average number of Bengalis present was 13, and of Madrasis 25 per cent. In connexion with this result one ought also to bear in mind that the different centres at which the Congress has held its meetings have been nearer and more accessible to Bengal than to Madras. A larger number of Bengalis, therefore, might well have attended, especially as the population of Bengal is far in excess of that of Madras.

(ii) We are told that the Congress is composed of briefless pleaders and English-educated youths of no occupation. It is a pity that our critics do not attend the Congress while it is in session. They would then find that the majority of the delegates are men of middle age. As to their occupations, the Congress Report furnishes the particulars. Undoubtedly a large number of representatives are drawn from the Bar, as is the case with public bodies the world over. But the greater number of these barristers are men of mature age, while many of them are the leaders of the Bar in their respective localities. It is impossible to give anything like a complete list of eminent members of the Bar who are supporters of the Congress, but I have picked out from each Province the names of a few men who have achieved distinction in their profession, who occupy a prominent position as members of the Imperial or Local Councils, or whose worth has been recognised by the Government itself by the bestowal upon them of high judicial appointments or titles of honour:

FROM MADRAS: Hon. P. Anandu Charlu; Hon. Sankara Nair; Hon. R. Rangiah Naidu; Hon. R. Kalayana Sunder

Iyer; Hon. N. Pantulu Guru; Hon. Bashyam Iyengar; Hon. S. Subramaniyam Iyer (Judge, High Court); Rai Bahadur Swanunda Iyer (Government Pleader, Tanjore); Rai Bahadur S. Lengaya Pantulu.

FROM BENGAL: Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter; Hon. W. C. Bonnerji; Hon. L. M. Ghose; Hon. Rash Bihari Ghose; Hon. Mohini Mohan Roy; Hon. A. M. Bose.

FROM BOMBAY: Hon. Pherozshah Mehta; Hon. V. R. Natu; Hon. C. H. Seetalvad; Rao Bahadur P. L. Magpurkur; Rao Sahib Shirluhkar; Rao Sahib S. B. Bhate; Rao Bahadur G. R. Yarud; Rao Sahib J. R. Nunkar.

FROM NORTH-WEST: PROVINCES: Hon. Ramkali Chowdhry; Hon. Sree Ram; Hon. Charu Chunder Mutter.

I have given only the names of those who have received some official recognition from Government, but I need hardly say that there are other members of the Congress who are equally distinguished in their profession. Of such men any assembly might well be proud, and it would be the height of absurdity to call them briefless and impecunious members of the Bar.

But what of the delegates who do not belong to the legal profession? Are they really immature youths, who have no ostensible occupation? Again, the Congress Reports tell a different tale. We find the zemindars, merchants, bankers, doctors, journalists, teachers in private institutions, tradesmen, clerks, Indian Government officials, and even priests of different religions fully and freely represented. The last Congress Report, for example, shows that amongst the delegates there were present: Zemindars or landholders, 275; merchants, bankers, and contractors, 167; tutors and teachers, 68; editors and managers of journals, 34; members of the medical profession, 11; and many others who were either retired Government servants, municipal commissioners, priests, clerks, or tradesmen.

(iii) The third charge brought against the Congress is that its proposals are utterly impracticable. It is, however, a significant fact that the Government itself has sometimes been gracious enough to adopt the proposals of the Congress. The Congress from the first agitated for the expansion of the Legislative Councils. The Government for a time turned a deaf ear to the prayers of the people and declared that it was impossible to grant the boon which was asked for. At the instance of the Congress, Mr. Bradlaugh introduced a Bill in the House of Commons dealing with the reform of the Councils. Suddenly what was once impracticable came to be regarded as falling within the range of practical politics, and the expansion of the Councils on an elective basis, and the right of interpellation, were granted.

The necessity for the separation of judicial and executive functions exercised by magistrates is a matter discussed by every Congress. At last the evil resulting from combination of these functions has been recognised by two Secretaries of State for India, Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross, and it has been shown by competent authorities in India that the new scheme could be introduced without much extra cost to the Government. This is a reform which is eminently practicable, and it would undoubtedly have been taken up by the Government of India if its attention were less completely absorbed in schemes of trans-frontier aggression.

The abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India is another demand made by the Congress. That this august body has run its course of usefulness is now dawning upon our rulers, who are gradually reducing the number of members composing it. Before long we may see its extinction an accomplished fact.

Since the Congress came into existence it has been praying for the reduction of the Home Charges. Until recently not many Anglo-Indians considered that this was a practical question. Now, however, the shoe is pinching, and we find distinguished ex-officials moving resolutions in the House of Commons having for their object the reduction of these charges, and Lancashire merchants join hands with them, having suddenly realised the fact that these charges are excessive and unjust to India. This is precisely what the Congress has been doing its best to impress upon the public for years past.

Take again the enormous increase of the military expenditure in India which the Congress has, with such persistence, made the subject of special attack. For daring to interfere with this question it has excited a good deal of odium among Anglo-Indians. But what do we find now? There is a split in the Anglo-Indian camp. In the Imperial Council itself, a member nominated by Government, Sir Griffith Evans, recently recorded a strong protest against the unnecessary increase in the military expenditure in India and called into question the necessity of India's being involved in so many frontier wars. Sir A. Colvin and Sir D. Barbour, not to mention others, have borne similar testimony.

Some of the other demands of the Congress, it must be admitted, do not meet with the approval of Anglo-Indians. But we have the consoling assurance that eminent and competent authorities in and out of the House of Commons are prepared to recognise the reasonableness and justice of our claims. True, the Government of India is opposed to the holding, in England and in India, of simultaneous examinations for the public services, but a vote of the House of Commons has declared that this measure of justice should be conceded to India. We cannot, therefore, be blamed if we refuse to accept the Anglo-Indian verdict that this question is outside the range of practical politics. Similarly in respect to other reforms which are proposed by the Congress—such as the introduction of a permanent settlement and the reduction of the duty on salt—we feel sure that sooner or later the justice of our demands will be recognised and our prayers granted.

Finally, I trust that Anglo-Indians will no longer ignore the fact that the Indian National Congress is a natural and spontaneous movement, on the part not of one race or one community, but of all races and all communities in India to agitate in a strictly lawful and temperate manner for the introduction of certain reforms in the administration, and that as such it is entitled to their sympathy and support, instead of the ridicule and the hostility which it meets with at the hands of some of them. As an Indian Christian I feel strongly that the lives and the interests of the members of my community are dependent upon the permanence of British rule in India, and I feel as strongly that we should be wanting

in the duty which we owe to our country if we were to fail to support a movement the sole object of which is undoubtedly to advance the national interests.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has approved of the appointment of Lord Welby as Chairman of the Royal Commission to enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India, and into the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India; and of the following as members of the Commission: The Right Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., the Right Hon. W. L. Jackson, M.P., the Hon. G. N. Curzon, M.P., Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart, Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. T. R. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Mr. R. H. Knox, and Mr. G. L. Ryder; also of Mr. Richmond Ritchie, as Secretary to the Commission.

The following important motion in the name of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., still appears in the Order Book of the House of Commons: That in the opinion of this House, in order to preserve and maintain the stability of the British power, the loyalty, confidence, contentment, and gratitude of the people of British India, to improve their material and moral condition, and to increase largely commercial and industrial benefits to the people of the United Kingdom, it is expedient that the solemn pledges of the Act of 1833, of the Proclamation of 1858 after the Mutiny, of the Proclamation of 1877 on the assumption of the Imperial title at the great Delhi Durbar, and of the further confirmation of these Proclamations on the Jubilee of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and Empress of India, should be fulfilled by, among other reforms, giving effect to the Resolution adopted by this House on 3rd June, 1893, viz.: That all open competitive examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such examinations in both countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit.

The Shahzada Nasrulla Khan, whose arrival in England was one of the "events" of last month, passed a somewhat exhausting day on the morrow of his arrival. It had been intended originally that he should join the Duke of Cambridge at Gloucester House and proceed to the Queen's Birthday ceremonial on the Horse Guards Parade with the Commander-in-Chief, but, quite late, the programme was altered and his Highness, at the request of the Prince of Wales, went direct to Marlborough House, where he joined the royal procession, having been provided with a horse from the Prince of Wales's stables. The Shahzada took his part as a distinguished spectator, resplendent in scarlet and gold with epaulettes of heavy gold lace. The sight was calculated to impress an Afghan prince.

From the parade ground the Shahzada went to Dorchester House and, almost from the moment of his return to his temporary home, a round of ceremonial visits began. First, at 1 o'clock, came the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, then came the Duke of Connaught, who was due at the Military Tournament later, and the Duke of Saxe-Coburg. Next his Highness proceeded to Marlborough House to return the visit of the Prince of Wales in all state, and from Marlborough House he proceeded to Clarence House to return the call of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg. Next came a call by the Duke of Cambridge, which was also returned.

These proceedings in themselves made a long day for a Prince who had come, only the day before, to the end of a long voyage. But in the evening he attended the State dinner at the India Office, where he met many persons connected directly and indirectly with the Indian Empire. Add to this a reception at Brook House, and it becomes clear that His Highness spent a fatiguing day. On the following day, Sunday, it had been intended that the Shahzada should visit the Zoological Gardens in the course of the afternoon, but he felt weary after the exertions of the preceding day, and the clusters of spectators who gathered outside Dorchester House from time to time reaped no reward. In fact, our visitor never moved out of doors at all. It was arranged that the Shahzada should visit the Queen at Windsor on Monday, May 27th.

The Amír's son is evidently imbued with the idea that time was made for princes. On the Saturday night after his arrival he kept the distinguished guests of the Secretary of State for India waiting forty minutes for dinner. At lady Tweedmouth's party afterwards he was nearly half an hour late. The Prince of Wales, the Princess Louise, the Duke of York, and other members of the Royal family awaited his arrival on the first landing of the staircase, looked down upon by the brilliant company thronging a staircase which reproduced in miniature the famous scene at the Foreign Office on other birthday nights.

Is it intended to make the Shahzada an honorary general in the British army? One asks because a British general's sword, with corresponding belt and sash, prepared in a great hurry by the famous sword-makers in Pall Mall, was presented to him, on behalf of the Government, before he landed at Portsmouth, and he wore these accoutrements at the Trooping of the Colour.

The following passage occurred in the speech which Lord Rosebery delivered at the National Liberal Club on May 8th:—"But, surely, we may say at least that, when the front Opposition bench in the House of Commons compare the fortunes of warfare with the front Government bench in the House of Commons, they must come to the conclusion that, during the present Session, to put it mildly, they have had very much the worst of it. (Cheers.) I think we must all remember the speech of Mr. Asquith on the Address in reply to Mr. Chamberlain. That was what we call a pulverizing speech. Then we must remember the speech of Mr. Fowler—

(cheers)—on the great—what am I to call it? I was going to call it "intrigue," but I will not use so base a word—I will call it the great transaction ending in a remarkable manœuvre—(laughter)—which dealt with the Indian cotton duties. Was there ever a speech more absolutely convincing delivered to the House of Commons than that of Mr. Fowler, or one which drove his opponents to more extreme straits?"

From the military point of view (the *Manchester Guardian* writes) India is, on her north-west frontier, like a town guarded against possible attack by a moat. One body of experts holds that the town is best defended by the depth and width of the moat. Another holds that the moat cannot be trusted, and that it would be better partly to fill it up or make it shallower, so that the inhabitants could wade out anywhere and meet the enemy in the middle of it, or perhaps on the other side. In the case of India the moat which this second body of experts propose to make fordable is a great band of mountainous desert. They wish to make it less impassable to themselves, and they are not afraid of making it less impassable to a possible enemy. But, in the case of the moated town, if its rulers found the experts remarkably divided on the question of filling up the moat or letting it be, and if they did not feel themselves equal to a decision on the professional disagreements of doctors, they might still be quite competent to count the cost of the two schemes of defence, and if they found that the expense of filling up the moat threatened the town with bankruptcy they would be justified in deciding to face a very doubtful and distant danger of military disadvantage rather than the immediate and very grave danger of financial disaster.

This (the *Manchester Guardian* continues) is the point which the English public has to decide. It may not be competent to decide between the precise values of "scientific" frontiers. But it is quite capable of taking roughly the opinions of the most competent men, and of ascertaining that, as we believe to be the case, there is no overwhelming balance of expert opinion in favour of either the "forward" or the Lawrence policy. This done, it is quite capable of counting the cost of the two policies. And if it finds that the one policy is ruinously expensive to India, while the other policy is comparatively cheap, then the conclusion is obvious. Whichever course is adopted will be called suicidal by many respectable military experts. But we would rather see a solvent India threatened with military danger by Lord Roberts and Captain Younghusband than a bankrupt India threatened with the same danger by Sir Neville Chamberlain and Sir John Adye.

Proposing the toast of "The Navy, the Army, and the Reserve Forces," at the annual festival of the Printers' Pension, Almshouse, and Orphan Asylum, on May 8th, the Prince of Wales said:—"We have had recently to congratulate ourselves on a short war—a brief campaign, which has been most successfully terminated—I allude to the Chitral campaign. (Cheers.) In that campaign the British and the native forces in India did their duty right manfully—(cheers)—and I think the spirit which has always existed amongst our soldiers has not in any way deteriorated, as has been so recently seen. (Cheers.)"

Is the "union of hearts" between India and Great Britain to be ratified, not in Parliament, but on the cricket-field? If so, the praise will be due to Mr. K. S. Ranjitsinhji. His first appearance, for Sussex against the M.C.C., was a triumph. He scored 77 not out in the first, and 150 in the second innings. He also took 6 wickets for 109 runs. The *Times* wrote of his performance:—"Everything was eclipsed by the fine batting of K. S. Ranjitsinhji, whose brilliant cutting and driving powers were sustained right through the two hours and a-half of his stay. The graceful precision of a powerful style greatly impressed both the general public and the members in the pavilion, and one of the oldest stagers at Lord's admitted its equality with many of the best things ever done on the ground. K. S. Ranjitsinhji certainly made a remarkable first appearance for his county, and after Saturday's feat it is better understood how quickly he acquired fame by his cricket at Cambridge. The fact that he made this 150 at the rate of a run a minute gives a good idea of the rapidity of his scoring. He went in second wicket down at 36, and was seventh out at 245, having hit two fives, 24 fours, five threes, and four twos. Messrs. Murdock and Newham gave him little aid, and when the fifth wicket went at 117 there was a probability of an easy and substantial win for the M.C.C."

Mr. Ranjitsinhji holds, at the time of writing, the third place in the list of first-class averages. He has scored 364 runs in five innings, and his average is 72·8.

The founders of the Pan-Indian Association, which has lately been established, declare that "within the last generation a combination of a set of causes have evoked forces, powerful almost as those of Nature, which are rapidly working to create a united and regenerated India. Feeling it to be the duty of every lover of India to devote himself to this work of regeneration, we have formed the Pan-Indian Association. India is at the present moment intimately linked with England. And England will be potent either for good or for evil in the moulding of India's destiny; the evil being the retardation of her inevitable progress towards a place in the first rank of nations. The peculiar work of the Pan-Indian movement in England will be to bring home to the British public the true state of things in India, that through ignorance of them the influence of England may not be for the evil."

The Association consists of gentlemen who are prepared both to speak at public meetings and to contribute to the Press on Indian political subjects. The Secretaries are Mr. P. Chaudhuri, and Mr. Jnanen N. Ray, 19 Tavistock Square, W.C. The Executive Committee consists of the Secretaries, and Messrs. Kumud Nath Chaudhuri, Jehander Ali Meerza, Niazuddin Khan, Deep Narayan Singh, Syed Aminuddin Ahmed Aschur, Muhammad Abdul Ghani, and Jyotish Ranjan Das.

BRITISH POLICY IN INDIA.

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

The following instructive correspondence has passed between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., and Colonel A. Parnell, the author of a book on British policy. It will be observed that Col. Parnell in his final letter is reduced to the admission that "in our national character there is too great a divorce of practice from precept."

25th March, 1895.

Dear Sir,—I have to thank you for sending me a copy of your "British Policy." It is a sad look-out for Britain and India when it is to be the policy—"In India we are *and ever must be* a despotic Military Power." Such an idea on the eve of the 20th century, after all the emancipating and glorious works of Britain during this century in the progress of mankind, after repeated and most solemn pledges and proclamations of more than sixty years, of equality of Indians with all other British subjects; of repeated professions of India to be governed for India's benefit! Is it then all a huge hypocrisy unworthy of the British? I can understand a Cæsar or an Augustus proclaiming such a thing. But where is that Roman Empire now? Never has an empire rested on brute force and never will. But while contemplating the grand schemes of developing military power of Britain in the East, what about the cost? Is that to be paid, as hitherto, by the helot or slave of the Indian of the "despotic Military Power," or is Britain going to pay for its own gain and glory? I have just glanced only at Chapter IV., "Our Eastern Empire." I do not know whether in any part of the book this fundamental question is at all considered.—Yours truly,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Col. The Hon. ARTHUR PARNELL.

1, St. Mathew's Road, St. Leonards, March 31, 1895.

Dear Sir,—I am much obliged for your letter of the 25th in regard to my work on "British Policy" which I had the honour to send you. In my remarks on India I had in my mind chiefly its defence by the sword from *external* sources of danger like Russia. And even as regards its domestic government you will, I think, agree with me that we (I mean the races of India as well as the native British) must always maintain a strong military force, virtually as police, to preserve order and liberty. I fully agree with you that self-government is the right of every British subject. But we must, I think, modify that principle in the various parts of the Empire, according to the dictates of our reason, to suit the peoples concerned. You know better than I what elements of disaffection exist, and probably always will, among the turbulent Native States not immediately under our rule. If the inhabitants of India were all of *your* race, culture and religion, there would, in my opinion, be no question about permitting India to govern itself.

As regards another point mentioned in your letter, it was not at all my intention to propose that any additional financial burden should be laid upon India. All I suggest is that the power and capacity of the India Office should be enlarged so as to embrace in its scope the affairs of the East generally, with India itself, so to speak, as a nucleus. For instance, I propose that the India and not the War Office, should have the control of the European army needed to reinforce the native troops; and that it should supply administrators to govern the eastern dependencies. Such a policy would, I imagine, greatly enlarge the sphere for the employment of educated natives and would tend to make India a more complete, self-dependent Asiatic power than it is at present.—Yours truly,

ARTHUR PARNELL.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., M.P.

4th April, 1895.

Dear Sir,—Thanks for your letter of 31st ult. The questions are simply these:—

1st. Are all the promises and pledges for past sixty-two years to treat us like, and raise us to the status of, British subjects, so many simple shams and delusions, or are they sincere? And though hitherto no honest attempt at all has been made, but on the contrary, the Indian authorities have invariably (except once partially, and that even afterwards cancelled), in the words of Lord Lytton, as Viceroy, adopted every device and subterfuge to make a dead letter of these pledges; is this to continue, and a military despotism, keeping us simply as helots, to be our future? Or is every effort to be *honestly* made to fulfil those pledges? If we are to remain simply subjects of despotism with the additional evils of that despotism being of aliens, which Macaulay describes as "the heaviest of all yokes is the yoke of the stranger," there is no hope either for us or for the British Empire. It will be the surest way of promoting the triumph of Russia. The good of the Empire and ourselves *entirely* depends, not upon brute force or any army, but upon the contentment and prosperity of India; and these depend *entirely* upon the honourable fulfilment of the pledges of sixty-two years.

2nd. Whatever of the Indian revenues is spent for protection inside or outside of India is as much (if not a great deal more, as I contend) for the benefit of Britain as for that of India. Should Britain, as simple justice between nation and nation, as between man and man, contribute its fair share of such expenditure or not? These two questions must be fairly and fully looked in the face by all honest Englishmen and honourably answered.

Whatever is the peculiarity of the condition of India has always been fully taken into account by the British statesmen and nation every time the pledges were made, and that was the special reason of these pledges, *i.e.*, to improve the political, social, and every other condition of civilisation of the Indians.

If this be not the mission of Britain in India, as it is always loudly proclaimed to be, then there is no reason for its existence in India, except that of simple greed for, and spoils of, conquest.

I appeal to men like you to consider these questions involving the weal or woe not only of the hundreds of millions of the human race, but even of that of the British themselves and their Empire. They can only sink or swim with the Indian Empire. Yours truly,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Col. The Hon. ARTHUR PARNELL,
1, St. Mathew's Road, St. Leonards.

1, St. Mathew's Road, St. Leonards, April 9th, 1895.

Dear Sir,—I am much obliged for your letter of the 4th, and I fully sympathise with you in all your wishes and hopes for the advancement and benefit of India. I wish that I was more competent to discuss the matter with you, but my personal knowledge of India is confined to about two years' residence there thirty years ago, and I am not well posted in its politics or in any recent measures connected with its internal administration. I am afraid that in our national character there is too great a divorce of practice from precept, and that we say a great deal more than we intend. There is much hypocrisy and dishonesty in our public doings. We are led by an anonymous press, and are almost incapable of thinking for ourselves on Imperial and Indian matters.—Yours truly,

A. PARNELL.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., M.P.

DINNER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS.

In honour of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., as President of the Tenth Indian National Congress, held at Madras in December last, a party of Indian gentlemen resident in Great Britain gave a dinner on May 4th at the Westminster Palace Hotel. Mr. D. Naoroji, M.P., presided, and there were present with the guest of the occasion Mr. A. C. Morton, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P. (Durham), Mr. Cremer, M.P., Mr. George Howell, M.P., Mr. Wilson, M.P. (Govan), Mr. A. Ghani, Mr. H. Roberts, M.P., Mr. A. Sen, Mr. Byles, M.P., Mr. Peter Paul Pillai, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, M.P., Mr. K. W. Bonnerji, Dr. T. M. Nair, and Mr. H. Mullick, hon. secs. Many of the company appeared in Indian costume.

After dinner letters were read regretting absence from Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., Mr. J. Dillon, M.P., Mr. Herbert Paul, M.P., Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., etc. Sir W. Wedderburn was unfortunately prevented from being present owing to the death of his sister.

In the course of the toasts, after that of "The Queen

Empress," Dr. NAIR, proposing "Parliament and the Parliamentary Committee," held that India wanted democratic reforms, and was only likely to get them from the House of Commons.

Mr. A. C. MORTON, responding, would not say whether the British ought to be in India, but being there they ought to govern in the interests of the Indian people. He hoped to see the time when the Radicals in Parliament would be able to help the people of India to get what was called Home Rule. (Loud cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN, giving the health of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., spoke of the kindness and readiness with which he consented to go out to India to preside at the Congress. The Indian people thus enabled one of the most respected and thoughtful of the Irish members to assure his compatriots that they were justified in supporting the Indian national cause. He noted particularly their attention to the resolution proposed by Mr. Paul on Indian Civil Service Examinations. (Cheers.)

Mr. WEBB, on rising to acknowledge the compliment paid him, was hailed with hearty cheers. He assured his audience that whatever might be his fate in life, whether rich or poor, the vision of his visit to India would ever revert to him as a most gratifying and living reminiscence. (Cheers.) He had been amused since his return at being asked how he understood the language, his querists forgetting that as good English was spoken in India as in England, and that it was a prime means of bringing the two peoples together. As for the Congress he would adopt the words of Sir R. Garth in describing it as an important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen, who in his (Mr. Webb's) opinion were working not for their own hand, but for the good of the people. (Cheers.) He expressed his sickening sorrow at the sad spectacle of the recent war—(hear, hear)—which he attributed to the all-pervading military system. He deprecated the attitude of superiority assumed by Englishmen in India, and he further deplored the neglect by a Liberal Government of Indian affairs. (Hear, hear.)

Other toasts were "India," given by Mr. J. Wilson and acknowledged by Mr. K. Chaudri and Mr. N. K. Khan; "The Land we live in and Central Finsbury," by Mr. H. Mullick, replied to by Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Byles, and Mr. Harper; "The Indian National Congress," by Dr. Murison, responded to by Mr. S. K. Mullick and Mr. M. A. Ghani; "Our Guests," by Mr. K. "Ghaswalla," and responded to by Mr. Howell and Mr. Martin Wood; and "The Chairman," proposed by Mr. H. Haridas.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—The article on "Indian Affairs" published in the *Times* of May 3rd, and doubtless reflecting the views of the Government regarding the enquiry into the expenditure of the Indian revenues, contains the following statements which deserve attention :—

"Mr. Fowler consented to a full scrutiny of the charges on the Indian treasury, but restricted the scrutiny from Imperial matters, such as frontier arrangements or the policy which regulates wars and annexations."

The enquiry, therefore, is to exclude the expenditure incurred in the trans-frontier expeditions, that is, the main source of the financial difficulties and the increased taxation in India. Furthermore, the word "consented" in the above passage might create the impression that the proposed enquiry, although restricted, may nevertheless substantially fulfil the object for which an enquiry was asked for in August last. Such an impression would, however, be entirely erroneous, seeing that what the member for Flintshire chiefly asked for was "a Parliamentary investigation into the condition and wants of the Indian people and their ability to bear their existing burdens"—questions which the Royal Commission is to be entirely precluded from investigating.

In another part of the *Times'* article it is said :—

"The ties which bind Great Britain to her colonies are not the ties of justice and fairness alone. Those ancient bonds are knit together not by conquest or annexation or treaty. But while India cannot expect from England the tenderness of a mother to her children, she may claim the generous treatment due to a great and loyal dependency."

These observations are irrelevant and uncalled for, seeing that India has claimed, not maternal tenderness or generosity, but the honest fulfilment of England's pledges to her—pledges on the faithful discharge of which depend alike the well-being of the Indian people and the honour of the English nation.

To deny to Her Majesty's Indian subjects an opportunity of substantiating the charges of oppression and injustice which they have repeatedly brought against the Indian Administration — an opportunity which would have been afforded by the Parliamentary investigation asked for by the member for Flintshire—must naturally create the belief that those charges cannot be refuted, and, at the same time, imbue the Indian people with the conviction that relief and redress are unattainable by them through legal steps and constitutional channels.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

May 20th. J. DACOSTA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1895.

ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW. Baden-Powell, B. H., "The Permanent Settlement of Bengal."

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. Beauchamp, H., "The North-West Frontier."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Candy, R. E., C.S.I., "Progress of Female Education in the Bombay Presidency;" Pope, G. N., Rev., D.D., "Leaves from an Old Indian's Note-Book."

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL COLONIAL INSTITUTE. Younghusband, F. E., Capt., "On the Kashmir Frontier."

LIPPINCOTTS' MONTHLY. Larned, W. T., "Effacing the Frontier" (?)

UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE. Marsh, P., Surgeon-Major, "Enteric Fever: The Scourge of India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1895.

HANNA, Colonel H. B.........."Can Russia Invade India?" (A. Constable.) .... 2s. 6d.
"Map to Illustrate the Chitral Expedition in North-West India." Second edition. (W. and A. K. Johnston.) .... 0s. 6d.

KAYE, Sir J. W., and HOLMES, T. R. E......... "Lives of Indian Officers." 3 vols. Third Edition. (W. H. Allen and Co.) Each vol. 6s. 0d.

KLEIN, AUGUSTA.........."Among the Gods. Scenes of India, with Legends by the Way." Illustrated. (Blackwood.) .... 15s. 0d.
"Great Britain's Colonial and Indian Possessions." (John Walker and Co.) .... 1s. 0d.

HUNT, Major S. LEIGH, Madras Army, and KENNY, ALEX. S., M.R.C.S......."Tropical Trials, A Handbook for Women in the Tropics." .. 7s. 6d.
"On Duty under a Tropical Sun." (W. H. Allen.) .... 4s. 0d.

BARRY, Bishop......"England's Mission to India." (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 0d

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JUNE, 1895.

NOTES ON THE INDIAN BUDGET.

BY A. J. WILSON.
(City Editor of the *Standard*; Editor of the *Investor's Review*.)

The Vice-regal Government of India is always patching and mending its form of accounts, but there is one change it never makes. It does not present a clear completed account for one year and an equally clear set of estimates for the next. Instead, there is a series of accounts at three separate stages of development dragged along year after year to the great benefit, perhaps, of a Finance Minister's speculative imagination, but of no possible advantage to any one else in the world. In pre-telegraph days there might have been some, though not great, excuse for this clumsy system, but now there is none, and it is unnecessarily ridiculous that, by the existing multiplicity of statements, the completed accounts for the year ended 31st March, 1894, should only be disclosed to India and England in the end of March, 1895. If the Government of India is not able to place a tolerably exact record of its previous year's income and spendings before the world at the fiscal year's end, then let the date of the Budget Statement be changed to April or May, so that we may get only two sets of figures—the finished accounts for the year completed in the previous March, and the first and final estimate for the year just entered upon. By the present arrangement there must be a great waste of clerical labour and it tends to looseness in expenditure and patch-and-mend book-keeping. What is the good of compiling a, presumably, careful Budget into which every probable item of income and outgo is brought on the threshold of a new year when at the end of it the Finance Minister can, with the coolest air in the world, give us a second Budget, adding here and deducting there, which he calls his "Revised Estimate"? The system is indefensible except on the ground that it enables the Executive to hide what it is doing.

Sir James Westland followed the usual plan in his preliminary budget excursus of 21st March last, and his opening statement enables us to see, by comparing it with previous efforts in the same line, how the trick works. "The revised estimates for 1893-94," said he, "which I presented last year worked out a deficit of Rx. 1,792,800, the actual result in making up the accounts is a deficit of Rx. 1,546,998, being Rx. 245,802 better than the estimate." But the original budget estimate of Sir David Barbour for the same year put the deficit at Rx. 1,595,100 so that he was nearer the actual outcome by almost Rx. 200,000 than his successor found himself twelve months after the budget had been originally drawn up. What was the use of all this estimating and re-estimating in such circumstances? The only result it can have is to lead people to suppose that nothing is ever to to be counted on in Indian Finances, except extravagance. The succeeding year 1894-95, Sir James Westland says, was going to come with a surplus of nearly ten million rupees instead of the deficits of between three and twenty-one millions, according to the dates at which the sums in addition and subtraction were worked out. Well, we should have been glad if the Government had been frightened the whole year through by the prospect of a big deficit. It might have spent less and had something now in hand to help to pay for the Chitral war. As matters are, the Government confesses by its successive estimates and "Budgets" that it really carries on a speculative undertaking. Sometimes luck helps it, sometimes not, but it plunges along hoping that the Exchange will go in its favour, or that a rise will take place in opium, or that it will escape a famine and by one means or another come out approximately right-side-up in the end.

Most of the expected surplus for 1894-5 is, on the Finance Minister's own confession, no genuine surplus at all. He got, or hoped to get, over nine million rupees more by opium, and he saved six millions by reduced payments to opium cultivators or 15,414,000 rupees in all, and these results are

the product of a decaying business and of a depletion of stock. Cultivators of the opium poppy have been underpaid and have reduced the acreage planted, and the Government has reduced its stock of opium from the standard 57,000 chests to *nil.* "The reserve of opium is absolutely exhausted," says Sir James, and the gain of the year in sale proceeds has come from enhanced prices alone. These enhanced prices increase the effectiveness of competition and endanger the whole revenue from this source, and now the Government as the result of under-payment of the cultivators and artificial enhancement of the price has to try to regain its old position by lowering the price of the drug and raising the allowance to the poppy-grower. We cannot call surpluses healthy which are thus produced. As for the "improvement" obtained by the new customs and excise duties on cotton fabrics, the less said the better for they promise to be the last straw.

It is more pleasant to take note of Sir James Westland's happiness of mind over the reduction in the military expenditure. We look for this reduction but cannot find it. It seems the Government did "save" three and three-quarter million rupees in the commissariat department by cheap food and fodder, and there were "other savings," not specified, presumably equally accidental and transitory, but against them have to be set an increase, which will be permanent and expansive, of nearly six and a-half million rupees in additional pay to British troops in India, the cost of the Waziri Expedition, etc., and the whole of the latter is not included in the outgoings of the year. Here is the leak which will by-and-by empty the reservoir. Thanks to the "scientific frontier" legend, and to the never-ending little wars it draws us into all round our far too disbanded border lines, thanks to the unchecked rapacity of the English War Office which systematically "scoops" India much as British privateers used to lighten treasure-ships on the Spanish main, our unhappy dependency has now to pay more than two hundred and fifty million rupees per annum for the maintenance of the army which holds it in subjection. This is more than a rupee per head for the population directly under British rule, and upwards of 45 per cent. of the entire revenue of India from the land rents, and opium, and every form of taxation. This does not, so far as we can judge, include the charge for all the pensions, which might be properly placed to the army account, nor the cost of the "military works" which the Government is continually wasting money upon.

The load imposed by the army alone has increased by fully fifty million rupees a year in ten years' time and it must, in the nature of things, continue to grow while the present policy is followed. This Chitral Expedition, for instance, will probably mean a permanent addition to our military expenditure of two or three millions a year, over and above its initial cost which no one can yet forecast, but which may well be fifty millions of rupees. And the worst of it is that the mere direct cost of the army is not nearly all for which the people of India have to pay, as the result of the fuss and push and muddle which now mark our dealings with outlying tribes. Most of the State railway expenditure, with its steady addition to the fixed charges of the Government—charges payable in England—has to be carried to the same account. "Capital outlay" of this sort is put at fifty-two millions rupees for 1894-95 and at forty-four millions for the current year. As there is little or no net return from most of this expenditure it ought really to be debited to revenue. But in that case where would any chance of "surpluses" be in our time? Putting together the cost of the army and other charges for debt interest, interest on railway capital, for pensions and furlough allowances, and including "works" and railway annuities—a small part of which represents redemption of capital—we reach a total of over 492½ million rupees, and the gross income of the State from every source is estimated for the current year at something less than 970 million rupees. From the latter total, however, we must deduct the cost of collection, including the working expenditure of the Post Office, etc., the working expenses of the State railways and canals, say 245 million rupees. This leaves little more than 233 million rupees for the domestic or civil expenditure of the Empire. No wonder that the Famine Fund has had to be suspended and that the Government is always at its wits' end for money.

We have dropped the "tens of rupees" mode of stating these totals. The people of India do not count in that way. A native infantry soldier has hitherto been paid only seven rupees a month and is now to have but nine. Not much chance of counting by tens for him, nor yet for the classes from which he is drawn. The true significance of the cost of our Government to India can never be grasped until we bring the total amount of it side by side with the probable revenue of the mass of the people in the currency to which they are accustomed. A sum of ninety-six millions of "tens of rupees" looks small for so large a country, but call it 960 millions straight out, and remember that the average earnings of the inhabitants is probably not much over 100 rupees per family, per annum, and the load begins to wear its true proportions.

The Finance Minister is very happy over the reduction effected in the debt charges by the conversion of the rupee loans last year, and has every reason to be; but this reduction—a mere five and a-quarter million rupees—does not help the people of India at all. The saving is more than swallowed

up by the steady growth in the general expenditure —a growth which has obliged the Government to appropriate the taxes specially and most solemnly dedicated to famine prevention works expenditure, as well as to hide in its preliminary estimates for the current year all mention of the cost of the Chitral War beyond a paltry million and a-half of rupees set aside to meet the preliminary cost of fitting out the expedition. Only by such unworthy devices is it possible to chirrup about a "surplus" or to prophecy that, beyond renewing the £2,000,000 of floating debt in London, there will be no borrowing operations there this year. This is a prophecy in which we have no faith. Through a series of events wholly beyond the control of India, the India Council has lately been able to sell its drafts unusually well on the London market, disposing, not only of all it required to make up the tale of £17,000,000, but doing so at rather better prices for the rupee than could have been obtained had no speculative rise occurred in silver. A continuance, however, of the higher prices for silver and of the conformity of the Indian exchanges with that price must tend to derange the export trade of India, and that trade, at its very best, is not sufficiently in excess of the imports to allow the Council to continue to draw freely without endangering a fall in the rupee, through time, to 10d., or even to 6d. The chronic exchange troubles, over which Indian finance ministers weep so much without ever opening their eyes to see what they mean, will soon reappear more aggravated than ever, because expenses, both Home and Indian, must continue to expand whether the Chitral War is paid for by a new loan or not. By borrowing alone can the semblance of solvency be kept up. On these grounds we quite expect to see the Viceregal Government in the London market again before this year is out. It cannot otherwise keep itself alive. Happily it can borrow on easy terms in sterling—at rather less than 6 per cent. to the Indian taxpayer—because it is a law of the money market that steady borrowers secure the best terms by use and wont, whether solvent or not; but this fortunate circumstance only tempts the Government on to its destruction—to a composition with its creditors. That is the best end possible for an individual who goes on borrowing but never pays back, and we see no reason to suppose that a better can befall an empire.

How much the total debt of India has grown in the last ten years or so we cannot exactly tell because it is so artfully split up into debt in India—*i.e*, rupee debt mostly held in the United Kingdom or by banks in India whose profits are sent home —debt in England, and railway capital, which is equally a burden of tribute on the Indian producer. We can, however, say how the sterling charges payable by India in England through the Secretary of State have expanded. They amounted to only £7,000,000 in 1870 and they are now tamely accepted by the financiers and rulers of India as a normal minimum of £17,000,000. Keep away the effects of constant loans and the total would be more than £20,000,000 per annum, or a burden on the Indian people, at the last year's rate of exchange, of more than 350,000,000 rupees per annum. And Mr. Fowler, cheery, ignorant optimist that he is, thinks India flourishes and pays her debts! The truth is that the real expansion of India's debt in the last twenty years has been partly hid by the substitution of terminable annuities for the capital of three of the railways built under the State guarantee. Over £46,000,000 has thus been hid away since 1879, and still the debt of India under all heads has, since that date and down to 1890-91, increased by more than £90,000,000 nominal; really, at the present value of the rupee, by a great deal more. There is but one end to this kind of progress, come it soon, come it late.

Other points in Indian finance and Sir James Westland's statement would well repay dissection, but space and time forbid. We have said nothing at all about the local burdens of India which now amount to nearly, if not quite, forty millions of rupees per annum. But we may note the fog Sir James is in at the exports of gold. Silver is pouring in, gold is flowing out, he does not know why. The reason is, we fancy, plain enough. An attempt is being made to give silver as "money" a fictitious value in India as against gold. It, therefore, drives out the gold because, so long as the importer of silver can exchange that metal for gold at a price profitable to himself, he will bring the silver into the country and buy the gold with it to be exported. Why cannot the Government, in need of taxes, clap a 20 per cent. duty on silver to stop this and give one more signal instance of its wisdom?

A. J. Wilson.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

By H. N. Haridas, F.I.In.
(Secretary of the Surat Congress Committee.)

The Secretary of State for India has after all redeemed his pledge by appointing a Royal Commission to enquire into the administration and management of the civil and military expenditure of India, and into the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India. Mr. Fowler may think that he has succeeded, by a cleverly worded reference, in limiting the scope of enquiry by the Commission. He declared in the House of Commons that he would carefully, to the best of his ability, guard against any enquiry

into the policy of annexation and aggression so wantonly indulged in by a clique of officials in India. The Commission has nothing to do with the aims and objects of the authorities, who have always shown fear of full public enquiry. Whatever the Imperial policy may be the Commission is not concerned with it. Its members cannot put a single question to any witness with a view to ascertaining the wisdom or the folly of certain measures. But the Commission can, I think, enquire into the exact legal status of the Government of India; and if it is to do its work carefully it will have to ascertain exactly the legal liabilities and capacities and the nature of that indescribable and unknowable body. When a searching enquiry is made by the Commission with this object in view, the questions of the scientific frontier, and annexation, and aggressive wars beyond the frontiers will be more questions of the legality of the transactions entered into by the Indian authorities than questions of Imperial policy. When the legal problem is once settled the problem of apportionment will not be half so difficult as it now appears to be.

Unlike the Executive Government of this country, the Government of India is the creature of an Act of Parliament.[1] The authorities that are responsible for the good government of that country, which is sometimes called a dependency, are invested with a trust for an indefinite time, and hence in law they are by implication made a Corporation.[2] This being so, when we examine the action and policy of the Government of India we must enquire if they be *intra vires* and legal. A corporate body constituted by statute for certain purposes, like the Government of India (which in respect of its legal character does not differ from an ordinary Corporation like the County Council or the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company), is regarded as so entirely the creature of the statute that acts done by it without the prescribed formalities, or for objects foreign to those for which it was formed, would be in general null and void.[3] The Royal Commission ought therefore to ascertain, in the first place, what exactly is the extent of the territories legally vested in the Government of India—in other words, what is the India of whose expenditure they are asked to examine the administration and management. The statute has defined India. For the purposes of the statute (21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, sec. i.) India means the territories vested in Her Majesty by the statute, or those territories which may be vested in Her Majesty in virtue of such rights as the old East India Company could have legally exercised before it ceased to exist in 1858. The Government of India has no jurisdiction over any territory which is not strictly India as defined by this Act of Parliament. Yet, strange to say, India, as now ruled over by the Viceroy extends in limits far beyond the India that was transferred to Her Majesty in 1858. A good many new territories have been since annexed and incorporated in the British India of to-day. The Commission will be only doing its duty if it demands authentic maps of the territories first vested in the Indian Government and then makes full enquiry into the history of these annexations and ascertains clearly the right or rights by which this Corporation has encroached upon the territories that it now claims as its own. That is to say, the Commission should clearly ascertain the right or rights which the old East India Company could have legally exercised in relation to such territories and in virtue of which only the annexations and extensions could have been justified in law. Having ascertained the extent of the territories which constitute India in the strict legal sense of the term—and I am confident that if thorough enquiry be made, much of that portion of the British Empire which is called India will be proved to be not India, and hence not within the purview of the incorporating statute—the Commission can then ascertain what exactly are the purposes of the Government of India contemplated by law. The revenues of India are to be applied and disposed of for the purposes of the Government of India alone and not for any other purpose whatever.[1] Next comes the question of military operations beyond the external frontiers of India. Parliament has in distinct terms laid down that not a penny shall be charged to the Indian revenues for such operations without the consent of both Houses of Parliament.[2] Any such charge created without due authority is void in law. If money has been spent without due legal authority, the Commission can trace it and insist upon its being paid back to India. It will thus be seen that in order to ascertain whether certain Indian expenditure has been *intra vires*, the Commission must examine the history of the transactions beyond the frontiers, must enquire into the annexations, and must ascertain the necessity of the various measures (miscalled "policy") which have been adopted by the authorities both in India and in England. So far as the Government of India is concerned there cannot be any legitimate policy which is not included within the four corners of the incorporating statute. As regards expenditure incurred simply to carry out an Imperial policy the Imperial treasury alone is strictly liable.

HARDEVRAM NANABHAI HARIDAS.

1 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106.
2 Maxwell on Statutes, second ed., p. 429; also comp. Williams *v.* Lords of Admiralty, 12 C. B., 420; Q. L. M. and P., 456.
3 Maxwell on Statutes, second ed., p. 361.

1 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, secs. 2 and 42.
2 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, sec. 55.

THE HOME CHARGES AND THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

BY T. LLOYD.

If one were asked to offer some suggestions to the Royal Commission which is to enquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenues, he would probably begin with the Home Charges. The finances of India would be in a far less unsatisfactory state were it not for this annual drain of sterling expenditure. India has made considerable progress during the present century and especially during the past thirty years. In many directions, no doubt, there

is waste, there is room for retrenchment, there is need for reform. But, to speak broadly and generally, India could well afford not only her present expenditure but even a larger expenditure, if it were raised differently and laid out differently, and above all if she had not to pay in London such an enormous sum every year in gold. The Home Charges vary. Sometimes they reach nearly 19 millions. Sometimes they are as low as 16 millions, accordingly as the India Council does or does not borrow in London. It may be said, however, in general terms that in one way or another India has to pay in London every year about 18 millions sterling in gold. But India raises her revenue in silver and in some way she has to exchange the silver for gold, or the equivalent of gold, in order to make the payments. As silver has been falling for nearly a quarter of a century, compared with gold, the cost of making those payments has steadily been increasing. To use the technical phraseology, India has been suffering every year a heavy loss by exchange; or, to use language more intelligible to the ordinary man, India has to raise more and more rupees every year in order to make the stated payments in gold in London. The Government of India has suffered heavily. So, too, have all persons in India who have to send money to England. So great has been the outcry that the mints have been closed and India has been deprived of any real standard of value at all. Her whole currency has been thrown into disorder in the vain hope that she may escape from this dreaded loss by exchange. The measure adopted was utterly unwise. What the Government of India ought to have done was not to meddle with the currency, which was an exceedingly good currency, but in some way or other to get rid of as much of the Home Charges as possible. What I propose to do just now is not merely to point out that the Home Charges can be reduced, but to show the way in which the reduction can be effected.

The Home Charges consist of four great items:—(i) payments for stores and materials of all kinds; (ii) payments to the British Government on account of the army and navy; (iii) interest upon the debt; and (iv) the salaries and pensions of officials. It is clear that the payments for stores and materials can be altogether got rid of. The present system is to buy the stores and materials in London through a Department immediately under the supervision of the India Council and to pay for them in London and in gold. But the Indian people themselves buy the European goods which they require—such, for example, as cotton piece goods—in India and pay for them in rupees. Why cannot the Government of India do what the Indian people in their individual capacity always do? There is nothing difficult in the matter. Our Colonial Governments and many foreign Governments buy in the way suggested. They issue specifications of the goods they require; they invite tenders to be sent in to them at their place of domicile; and they pay for the goods, when they are accepted, in the money of the country. What all foreign individuals do and what so many foreign and Colonial Governments do can be done by the Government of India. The reply which is usually made is that the present system is as good as any that can possibly take its place; that the greatest care is exercised by the Committee of the India Council within whose charge the matter is; and that the officials are highly trained experts and men of undoubted honesty. I need not discuss the questions whether the India Council anxiously superintends these transactions and whether the officials employed are men of the highest honour. It is not because I think the Council incompetent or doubt the honesty of the officials that I suggest the change. It is simply to escape from the necessity of having to pay so much gold in London every year. The value of the stores and materials varies. If there is active railway building, for example, more stores are required than when there is little railway building. Similarly in regard to warlike stores and everything else that the Government undertakes to supply. But roughly it may be said that the value of the stores and materials averages not far short of one-tenth of the whole of the Home Charges. Now, if the Home Charges could be cut down by a million and a-half or two millions sterling every year, that would be an immense advantage. The bills which the India Council has to sell in London would be reduced by that amount, which would certainly raise, or at all events tend to raise, the value of the rupee. I do not now urge that there would be much saving to the Government of India. As I am not disputing that the India Council and its officials perform their duty admirably, I assume that the price they pay for the stores is the just market price. If the stores were tendered for in Calcutta or Bombay an equivalent price, therefore, would have to be paid in rupees. The gain to India in this way would be, not a reduction in price, but a reduction in the Home Charges and consequently in the bills sold by the India Council. India would have to find, in plain language, about two millions sterling less of gold than she has to find at present, and that reduction would be of immense benefit to her.

The second item in the Home Charges consists of payments by the Indian to the British Government on account of the army and navy. When the direct government of India was assumed by the Queen it was decided that the old system of keeping a separate European force should be abolished and that the European army serving in India should be a portion of the Imperial army. Furthermore, it was decided that the naval service should be Imperial and not merely Indian. India of course has to pay for the army and navy which assist in protecting her. I am not at present concerned to enquire whether the naval and military forces are too large or whether the charges put upon India are too great. For the present purpose I shall assume that the interests of India have been honestly safeguarded, that she really does require such an army and such a navy as she has to pay for, my object being at present to show how the Home Charges can be reduced, not how retrenchment can be effected. India has not only to pay for the troops actually serving in India but also she has to contribute a portion of the cost of training the troops, and of the pensions. She has to pay the cost of the troop-ships, and she has to contribute to the navy. At present

India has to pay to the British Government the sums so due from her in gold or the equivalent of gold; and the means of payment are found by the sale of the Council's drafts. In round figures these payments somewhat exceed a million and a half sterling and, added to the payments for stores and materials, they would make between three and four millions sterling, or say from one-sixth to one-fifth of the Home Charges. If the Home Charges could be reduced by one-fifth or 20 per cent. it is clear that the advantage to India would be immense. She would, of course, have to pay equivalent sums, but she would pay those sums in silver and not in gold, and she would not have to sell bills in London that would realise, say, eighteen millions sterling every year. The bills she would have then to sell would be rather under fifteen millions. Now, it is clear that, just as the stores could be paid for in India, so the contributions on account of the army and navy could be made abroad and in silver, instead of at home and in gold. The Imperial Government employs both troops and ships in the silver-using parts of the world — in Hong-Kong, the Straits Settlements, the Chinese Seas, the Persian Gulf, and so on; and the Imperial Government has to send out the means of paying for the troops and the ships. Under the present system we require India to pay her contribution in London; to send the money from Calcutta to London; and then we require the Imperial Government to send it to the Persian Gulf, Aden, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and elsewhere. Would it not be a much simpler plan to instruct the Government of India to remit the amounts due from it to the Home Government directly to the ports and stations in the silver-using countries? Would it not be as easy to pay for all the Imperial expenditure in the Persian Gulf and in the Pacific from India as from home? India then would remit in silver and the Home Charges would be correspondingly reduced, while our own expense in remitting would be removed altogether or greatly diminished. Of course, it is said that the present system works admirably; that it has been elaborated during many years; that it is brought now as near perfection as possible; and that a change would only do harm. We are accustomed to protestations of this kind from officials all over the world. Everything that is established is naturally, in their eyes, as near perfection as possible. But the ordinary man is not content to take the assurances of officials as gospel, and will refuse to believe that officials could not be found to do the work as well in India as in London.

The last two items in the Home Charges are interest on debt, and salaries and pensions. These, of course, cannot be reduced immediately. Whatever engagements India has entered into, either with her creditors or with the officials who have served her, she must necessarily carry out. But she could at least avoid increasing these two items, and she might gradually decrease them by a different policy. For instance, if she were to borrow at home instead of in London, there would be no further growth in the interest on debt in London. There would, of course, be a growth in India. But the payments would be made in silver and, what is still more important, they would be made in the country itself. Let us suppose that India were to borrow such a sum as would involve the payment of interest amounting to a quarter of a million sterling every year. It would be a matter of very great importance whether the quarter of a million sterling was sent altogether out of the country or was paid in the country. In the former case there would be a drain from the country. In the latter case the money that would be taken from the taxpayers would be paid to the creditors, and there would be a quarter of a million sterling every year which the creditors might use either in business or in increasing their comforts. In either event they would give employment to more labour and would stimulate industry. It would, therefore, be possible immediately to reduce the Home Charges by about one-fifth, and it would gradually become possible to reduce them perhaps by as much more by ceasing to borrow in London whenever possible, and by altering the arrangements which have hitherto been in force with regard to officials. The official mind is naturally indisposed to changes of this kind. They are, it is said, too sweeping; they disturb the course of business; and they throw people out of employment. But the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure ought to be above such considerations as these. It ought to look singly to the interests of India, and it ought to recommend whatever, upon full enquiry, it finds to be conducive to those interests.

T. LLOYD.

INDIAN TRADE AND TRADE IN INDIA.

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

III.

In the last article on this subject, which appeared in the November number of this journal, attention was called to the possibilities of the fruit trade of India. The abundance and the variety of Indian fruits are proverbial, and it is well known that a moderate amount of care bestowed on their culture would speedily develop many marketable kinds. It is true that there are a large number of inferior fruits in India which could never become articles of profitable export, but the number of those which could be exported in some condition or other is by no means inconsiderable. Some of them, such as the grapes from Afghanistan, are peculiarly fine in flavour, and there are several varieties of these grapes which have never yet found their way to Europe. The size and flavour of some of them would command a price which would return a fair profit after careful packing and transport. The apples and the pears of Kashmir are famous for their delicacy and beauty. But, of course, fruit of this kind requires special appliances for its proper transit. This, however, is not the case with peaches, which grow to great perfection on the Nilgiris and in Bengal, or with apricots, which thrive in Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Chamba. These fruits can be crystallized readily and cheaply in a country like India, where sugar grows in every cottage garden, and the crystallized fruit can be safely conveyed to

any distance. The root of ginger, which is cultivated in all the provinces of India, admits of a large extension of trade by crystallization or preservation in syrup on the plan pursued by the Chinese. Apricots can also be dried, and so can pears, and in this form they can be sent to any distance without damage. One advantage of sending such fruit in the dried or simply crystallized state is that decorated boxes are not needed. If the fruits are packed in simple wooden boxes, lined with clean paper, it is sufficient for the voyage, and on reaching England they can be repacked in any way that may be desired. It will surprise stay-at-home Indians to hear that the retail price for crystallized apricots in London is Rs. 3 12a. per *seer*, and dried apricots sell for Rs. 1 14a. per *seer*.

The peach is another fruit which is much esteemed in Europe though little eaten by Indians. It is indigenous on the Himalayas, and occurs in every village of the North-West Himalayan mountains. The peach is also frequent throughout the plains, and admirable peaches are produced even in the neighbourhood of Calcutta. The Persians have a way of drying peaches, and threading them on strings. In this way they can be carried for long distances, and preserve their flavour for months. They could be simply dried and packed in boxes, and there can be little doubt, considering the cheapness with which they could be grown in India and the good price they would command in England, that satisfactory profit would be made by trading in them.

The cheapness of pineapples in India, where they are sold by retail at the rate of four or five a penny, renders them a good article of trade. They can be boiled in syrup, and sent to Europe in tins. The hard outside portion of the pineapple should be cut off, and the fruit cut into thick slices. Reasonably large tins might be used for this purpose; because the small tins, in which pineapples are usually sent from the West Indies, are not infrequently opened by salesmen in England, and the fruit is taken out and sold by weight. Ordinarily each pineapple comes in a separate tin; but if the tins are to be opened and the fruit is to be sold by weight, the size of the exporting tin, within moderate limits, is immaterial. The leaves of the pineapple yield an excellent fibre, which can be extracted by steeping in water for eighteen or twenty days.

India produces many other fruits than those to which the attention of our Indian friends is herein directed, but none of them are now used for export. The truth seems to be that, as these fruits are exceedingly cheap in India, it never occurs to the Indian trader that they might be dear in some other country, and that profitable trade often consists in taking an object from a place where it is cheap and selling it where it is dear. It is the unfortunate prejudice which Indians have against voyaging to foreign parts which prevents them from knowing what the inhabitants of the rest of the world want, and the prices they are willing to give. The people of India make no commercial use whatever of their bamboos, which grow in the wildest profusion throughout the length and breadth of the land. The Japanese by coming to Europe and residing there saw the numerous useful purposes to which bamboo canes could be applied in the West, and, in the course of a few years, they have built up a vast industry, from which their country is deriving great advantage. This instance shows that even what appears to be a contemptible object can be made highly profitable when people know how to use it.

It is not only the better kinds of fruit which are useful, but some of the uneatable species have considerable value. The sour oranges and lemons of India are the best kinds for the manufacture of lemon-juice. There are species of *khatta*, or sour oranges, which are sometimes called *karna* in Northern India, and grow freely in the vicinity of Gonda, Etawa, Multan, Lucknow, and Calcutta, which can be used for manufacturing the well-known candied orange and lemon peel of commerce. This is produced by cutting the fruit into quarters from top to bottom; the pulp is removed and placed in a vessel, and squeezed to produce lemon-juice. The quarters of peel are then thrown into cold water to soften. They are then boiled until they become tender. Next they are placed in cold water for two days, care being taken to renew the water two or three times each day. Then they are allowed to drain. Sugar is now boiled until pearl-like bubbles form on the surface, and then the sugar is allowed to cool until it becomes tepid. The drained peel is placed in the sugar, and allowed to remain in it for eight days, care being taken to remove the pieces of peel every day, to re-boil the sugar until pearl-like bubbles form on its surface, and to replace the peel when the sugar becomes tepid. On the eighth day the sugar should be re-boiled as before, and the peel should simmer in the hot sugar, until, when a little of the sugar is cooled, it is found to crumble in the fingers into a flour-like powder. Then the peel should be quickly removed, and drained and cooled on sieves or similar surfaces. Finally the pieces of peel should be dried in a slow oven, or in the sun on dishes protected from the flies by wire covers, or similar appliances. Large quantities of this candied peel are annually imported into India, the whole of which could be made on the spot, giving rise to a very simple and profitable industry.

Jamaica sends to England about 45,000 gallons of lime-juice every year, and as it is a refreshing, cooling drink, and anti-scorbutic, there will always be a large demand for it. It is made from the wild lemon (*Pahari nimbu*) which is found in India, and can be easily cultivated. The peel is cut off in three thick slices, so as to leave the pulp in the middle three-cornered in shape with a bit of peel at each end. The pulp is cut across the middle, squeezed so as to press out the juice, and then strained in order to free it from the seeds and bits of skin. It is then filtered. To prevent spontaneous decomposition the juice is gently boiled in a copper vessel, care being taken not to scorch or burn the juice, because that destroys its pleasing acidity. The more the juice is condensed by this process the more valuable it becomes. It is exported in clean bottles. The wholesale price of lemon-juice is 10 annas per gallon, and as the process of manufacture is childishly simple, that price is found to yield a good profit. The juice of the sour orange can be prepared in the same

way, and this sells for as much as 20 to 25 annas per gallon.

The profit on lime-juice manufacture is greatly increased by extracting the oil from the pieces of peel cut off from the fruit. They are allowed to remain one day in the vessel in which the workman has thrown them. On the second day he places a flat piece of clean soft sponge in his left hand, one end of which is wrapped round his forefinger. With his right hand he places on the sponge one of the pieces of peel with the outside downwards. He then squeezes it gently so as to make the inside portion rise up a little, and this cracks the minute vesicles in the skin, and the oil comes out on the sponge. Four or five squeezes are all that the workman gives to each bit of peel, and he takes care not to squeeze any bit of pulp which may be attached to it. As the sponge gets saturated with the oil, the workman wrings it forcibly, and receives its contents in a wooden vessel. In this the oil gradually separates from the watery liquid which accompanies it, and is poured off carefully into bottles. It sells at a very high price, about Rs. 250 per *seer*. The process is tedious, but is well suited to patient Indians, and is found to be a profitable industry in Italy where wages are much higher than they are in India.

Neroli oil is another product of the bitter oranges found wild in India. It is produced by distilling the white petals of the flowers in water, and cooling the steam as it passes through a pipe. The liquid which results consists of highly scented water, with the peculiar oil of the orange floating on the top. This Neroli oil is a delicious perfume, selling for Rs. 250 per *seer* when it is carefully made. The water is sold separately, under the name of Orange-Flower Water, for 20 or 25 annas per gallon. There are three kinds of orange-flower water—one made from the flowers themselves, as just described, another produced by mixing distilled water with Neroli oil, a third made by distilling the leaves, the stems, and the unripe fruit of the orange tree.

It will thus be seen that the wild oranges of India, of which there is an immense variety, totally neglected, could easily be converted into sources of commercial profit. The manufacturing processes which are involved are exceedingly simple, and require no machinery or expensive plant. Scores of suitable varieties of orange and lemon grow wild, and could therefore be cultivated at very slight expense. A few wooden bowls, one copper vessel, a simple still, and a few bits of sponge, are all the apparatus required. The demand for bottles for the lime-juice would stimulate that nascent industry. The price of superior bottles for the oil would be immaterial, as the value of the oil is so great that it would allow a good price to be paid for the small number of bottles required to convey it. The small bulk of these products in comparison with their value renders them well suited for transit to great distances. Our Indian friends will thus see that there are simple industries within their reach which involve little or no capital, and in no way offend against their social prejudices.

INDIA AND THE NATIONAL REFORM UNION.

[BY A MEMBER OF THE UNION.]

The meeting held in Manchester on May 1st under the auspices of the National Reform Union was, as the *Manchester Guardian* said next day, peculiarly opportune, and the news from the Chitral expedition which appeared in the papers during that week—both before and after the meeting—served as an admirable object-lesson of the principles which the speakers enunciated—principles which both Mr. Stanhope, the President, and Mr. Symonds, the Secretary of the Union, showed to be strictly in accord with the advanced Liberal creed which the organisation has always professed. It is noteworthy that three successive Presidents of the Union—Mr. Slagg, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. Stanhope—have identified themselves with this question of the good government of India. Opportune the meeting certainly was; but it was not opportunist. For, apart from its general policy on such questions, the Union decided by a special resolution passed at the Westminster Conference last summer to take up the question of the administration of the affairs of India.

Nor must the action of the Union in this matter be regarded as solely or even mainly a Lancashire movement, in spite of the fact that the recent meeting was held in the district and county which are most affected by the imposition of the Cotton duties. As just stated, the decision to include the Indian question in its programme was taken by the Union last summer, long before it was anticipated that those duties would be sanctioned by Mr. Fowler.

The value, therefore, of the meeting can only be fully realised by an appreciation of the fact that it gave public expression to the opinions held and promulgated by the members of a great political organisation, whose special function has been and is to educate the electorate of Great Britain in principles which it desires to see embodied in legislation and carried out in policy.

Tenacious as Englishmen are of their rights and privileges and interests, they are *au fond* both generous and just, and have shown themselves capable of making great self-sacrifices and submitting to severe trials and hardships in causes which commended themselves to their instinct of justice. For a proof of this we need look no further back than the period of the American Civil War, when the people of Lancashire submitted patiently to intense suffering and severe privations, and steadfastly refused to join the party which sought to make England side with the South against the North, because they regarded the former as the champions of slavery. Yet these are the people who are accused of wishing to sacrifice the poor rayats of India to their own selfish trade-interests. Those who make this charge neither know the men of Lancashire nor understand the grounds on which so many Radicals condemn the Government of India.

The position taken up by the National Reform Union is one which ought to commend itself to all sound Liberals. The Indian Government is met

year by year with a recurring deficit, to meet which it has tried every possible expedient save the very obvious and proper one of retrenchment in expenditure. The Finance Minister, Sir J. Westland, did indeed state in his Budget last year that one of the modes by which he hoped to reduce the deficit was by "stringent economy in expenditure." But readers of INDIA know what that economy amounted to and in what departments it was exercised. They know, too—and it is the object of the National Reform Union to make it known to the whole country—that no trifling economies of such a character are of any use, and that as the increase of expenditure is almost entirely due to the "forward" military policy on the North-West frontier, so the only possibility of reduction lies in the abandonment of that policy.

But it is not merely to the expenditure that politicians like Mr. Stanhope and the members of the National Reform Union object, but to the policy itself. When that "prancing pro-consul," Lord Lytton, was sent out to India by Lord Beaconsfield, and deliberately instructed to pick a quarrel with the Amír of Afghanistan, they uttered their protest against the iniquity of such a policy, and heartily supported Lord Hartington in his repudiation of it. His indignant question—"What right have we to be there?"—they now repeat in reference to Gilghit and Chitral, and they refuse to acquiesce in the continuance of a wrongful policy, simply because it is now pursued under the *ægis* of a Liberal instead of a Tory Government.

The responsibility of the possession and the government of India is not felt by the people of England; and the perfunctory manner in which the affairs of that great country are discussed in Parliament is an indication and a measure of popular ignorance and carelessness on the subject. Only when all eyes are turned to some centre of attraction, as to Chitral recently, do Englishmen seem to be even aware of the existence of India, and it needs some great and dangerous crisis to awaken their interest in it. Yet they talk glibly of its being "the brightest gem in the Crown" of their Sovereign, and lightly accuse all who try to warn them of the dangers of the policy they are pursuing of being "little Englanders" and supporters of the doctrine of "Perish India."

It is to save both England and India from the catastrophe that will inevitably come from such a policy that a few earnest Radicals have taken up this question; and the National Reform Union will have done no better work in the past than that to which it has now committed its organisation—namely, to instruct the electorate and enlighten public opinion on the vital importance of governing India on the sound Liberal principles of Peace, Retrenchment and Reform.

INDIA AND BRITISH CONSTITUENCIES.

IMPORTANT MEETING IN MANCHESTER.

IN connexion with the National Reform Union, a meeting was held on May 1st, in the Gentlemen's Concert Hall in Manchester, to consider the civil and military expenditure in India. The chair was occupied by the Hon. Phillip Stanhope, M.P., who was supported by Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., Mr. Naoroji, M.P., Mr. R. Barlow, Mr. G. C. Mandleberg, Mr. J. Petrocockino, Mr. George Rhodes, Mr. T. C. Abbott, Mr. R. Ramsbottom, Mr. T. Eggington, Mr. G. W. B. Sanderson, Mr. A. C. Yates, Mr. Gordon Hewart, and Mr. A. G. Symonds (secretary).

Mr. C. E. Schwann, M.P., wrote:

"I much regret that a previous engagement to speak in Salford to-night prevents me, as I should have wished, from being present with my colleagues, Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. D. Naoroji at your meeting to-night to consider the economies which may be practiced in the expenditure of India. Were it lightened, as it might well be, by the curtailment of border wars (so dear to the heart of the military "forward" party in our Indian Army as affording opportunities for earning distinction and promotion) and if the Indian Government had not listened to the clamour of Anglo-Indian officials and saddled the Indian nation with an additional one million pounds of taxation annually in order to compensate to some extent those officials for the loss in remitting part of their salaries to England at the reduced value of the rupee, probably the extreme step of putting a duty on certain cotton goods on entering India might have been averted. Nothing but good can arise to the Indian people and to ourselves through the examination of the financial position of India and the reforms which may seem practicable in the Indian Budget. The era of great expenditure in strategic railways ought surely now to come to an end. Our main security in India from the attacks of other nations is surely based on the contentment and prosperity of our fellow-subjects in that great country. But to produce that contentment we must not burden them with the cost of wars, either in Burma or elsewhere, which concern them or their interests but very indirectly."

Mr. C. H. Hopwood, M.P.. wrote:

"The meeting appears to me useful and well-timed. There seems to be an unwise action on the part of the Indian Government in meddling with the concerns of the tribes neighbouring the frontier. These interferences are prompted by military authorities, who are never backward in advising recourse to their weapons. Our expedition to Chitral, involving the expenditure of huge sums, and the indescribable hardships, wounds, and loss of life to so many brave men, attended with the public fear for months of some dreadful disaster, if not massacre, is sufficient example to support our argument that peaceful and moderate counsels are the best defence of India, and the effective, if not sole, cure for the poverty of her finances."

Mr. Thomas Snape, M.P., wrote:

"I am quite in sympathy with the object of the meeting. A recent number of the *Indian Spectator* contains the following editorial remark, which I am sure will commend itself to the meeting: 'We in India, have no special liking for import duties on Manchester goods. We shall have no objection if the deficit that is facing us is met by contributions from the Exchequer, or if the deficit itself be removed by thorough-going retrenchment in the military department—nay, we shall hail such results with joy, and be for ever grateful to Lancashire if it is the means of bringing them on.' The excise duties also, by equalisation with those at home, might be made te add to the Indian revenue, to the advantage of our Indian fellow-subjects. I trust that one result of the meeting may be to lead the Indian authorities to devise other than the vicious methods of levying duties on imports for raising the revenue necessary to carry on the Government."

Mr. J. F. Cheetham wrote expressing regret at his inability to be present "upon an occasion which in view of the serious financial difficulties of the Indian Government, and the consequent reimposition of import duties must possess both for Lancashire and the country at large a very exceptional degree of interest and importance."

Letters apologising for absence had also been received from Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., Mr. Caleb Wright, M.P., Sir Joseph Leigh, M.P., and Mr. C. P. Huntington, M.P.

The CHAIRMAN said the meeting had been called primarily because of the interest recently renewed in Indian finance by the reimposition of import duties in that country, but the reimposition of those duties was not the subject they intended to discuss. Their contention had been, was, and would be, that those import duties—allowing them to be absolutely essential

to balance the Indian Budget at the present moment—should not and would not be necessary if due economy was introduced into the military charges and also into the civil administration of India. In any event he did think that Mr. Fowler and the Government would have done well, if, before consenting to the reimposition of import duties of any description, whether upon cotton goods or other commodities, they had awaited an examination of the whole position of Indian finance by an independent Commission appointed for the purpose of seeing whether by the introduction of economies in various directions the reimposition of the import duties could not have been rendered unnecessary, and thus avoid what no one believing in the greatest facilities for commercial development between India and Great Britain could but regard as a most retrograde step. When Mr. Fowler was able to again devote his attention to public affairs, as they trusted he might be able to do soon, it was to be hoped that, in the first place, in consultation with those who were best fitted to advise him—the representatives of the various trades and manufacturing interests of Lancashire—he would, in accordance with his pledges on the subject, come to an understanding with the view of making the countervailing duties absolutely effective, so as to prevent the import duties becoming protective in any way whatever. But, more than that, they expected Mr. Fowler, in fulfilment of the promise he made in speaking on the motion of Mr. Samuel Smith, would take immediate steps to nominate a Select Committee, or, if he wished it, a Royal Commission, which should have before it all the information at the disposal of the India Office, so that the whole question of Indian expenditure might be fairly and dispassionately considered. (Hear, hear.) The first of the points to which he desired to draw attention was our military policy on the North-west frontier. They were all proud of the gallant and heroic efforts of our troops in that region. (Cheers.) But was the policy pursued altogether judicious in the interests of India and of this country? In the past, as they were aware, mistakes had been made. The great Afghan campaign—glorious in a military sense—was a mistake in a political sense. It had now been found out that Lord Lawrence's policy was the right one and that our safety was best consulted by giving the Afghans the management of their own country and binding them by treaty to maintain our Imperial interests. (Hear, hear.) It was possible that a similar policy pursued with regard to the tribes with whom we had recently been involved would have avoided an enormous expenditure. Unfortunately the officers whom we sent to the north-west frontier, gallant and distinguished as they had undoubtedly proved themselves to be, were also, not perhaps unnaturally, anxious to show that they were made of the same metal as their fathers, and were not altogether indisposed to follow what had been called the forward policy. That policy was all very well where it was a wise policy, but countless millions had been spent and very many valuable lives had been lost, and we were not sure that as a consequence our defensive position had been improved. Then we had spent enormous sums in preparations for the future. No less than 15 millions had been spent in making strategical military railways. They might be permitted to ask whether most of the financial embarrassment of India did not arise from that great expenditure, and whether the commercial interests of India were not being prejudiced by it. (Hear, hear.) Another thing which had always impressed him was the way in which the War Office took advantage of the non-representative character of the Indian Government in order to square its own expenditure by thrusting upon the Indian Exchequer so large a portion of our military charges. So far as the great self-governing colonies were concerned they were able to take good care of themselves, and it certainly could not be argued that in contributing about ten per cent. of our military expenditure in connexion with our colonial possessions they had been unduly charged, but with India the position was entirely different. What were called the "Home" Charges for the British forces in India amounted to not less than £810,000. We also charged India £500,000 a year alone for training recruits, who went, it was true, for a few years to India, but who became soldiers of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) Another point worthy of consideration was the allowance we made to the Indian officials for the fall in the value of the rupee. This charge on the natives of India came to about a million a year; and it was to be observed that this Exchange Compensation Allowance, indefensible as he believed it to be upon general grounds, became especially so in the case of salaries not transmitted to Europe. It was facts like these which had caused a financial embarrassment in India, and had caused the reimposition of import duties on an article which was almost a primary necessity. An impartial enquiry, he believed, would show many extravagances of expenditure in India. That fact once disclosed, they might be sure of a return to commercial freedom in India. (Cheers.)

Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., said he was glad to have this opportunity of saying a few words at Manchester bearing on the question of the cotton duties. The two points he proposed to discuss were practical ones, and they were these:—1. How comes it that the cotton duties have been imposed? 2. What had we better to do in order to get rid of those duties? People in this country, he thought, were beginning to understand that the excessive and ever-increasing Indian expenditure was not only a question for the Indian taxpayer, but was also a question for the British taxpayer, and if it were a question for the British taxpayer generally, much more was it a question for those who supported the industries of Lancashire. Because there could be no doubt it was this excessive expenditure which had produced a deficit in Indian finance, which in turn had caused the cotton duties to be imposed. If the duties had been rendered necessary by useful expenditure for the safety of the Empire, or in developing the resources of India and trade, it would have been difficult to quarrel with such expenditure, but he could show that the deficit had been caused by extravagance in civil and military establishments. Vast sums had been spent in little wars beyond the frontier, wars of adventure and of aggression on our neighbours, and he held that such expenditure, instead of being necessary and beneficial, was purely mischievous. It was doing harm to our position, and endangering the safety of our Empire, because it was upsetting the good old traditional policy known as the policy of Lord Lawrence—the policy of keeping within our own bounds, cultivating friendly relations with our neighbours, keeping a full treasury, and producing contentment among the whole population of India. (Cheers.) The expenditure of which they complained showed no signs of decrease, nor even of being stationary. On the contrary, it was constantly increasing. In ten years it had gone up by no less a sum than twelve millions of tens of rupees. Even from a military point of view the policy which rendered such expenditure necessary appeared to be a mistake; for every general officer of experience who wrote to the newspapers in support of this policy four or five wrote to repudiate it. And from a political point of view, such a policy of aggression and restlessness in India was most dangerous and mischievous, because the want of consideration for the rights of our weaker neighbours naturally alarmed the Native States of India and made them suspicious of all our intentions. This policy was in that way undermining our position throughout India. Then there was the question of heavy taxation in India. He had observed that in all the schemes of Russian generals for the invasion of India the one great hope they had was that while the British army stood face to face with them along the frontier there might be a rising amongst the people of India against their oppressors. The real safety of our position in India was to make that impossible by having no fiscal oppression in India and by spending money on the useful development of the country. In that way the people of India, instead of being a danger, a sort of powder magazine behind us, would be as a tower of strength to defend us against all comers. He had spent a quarter of a century of his life in the service of the Government of India, and when he retired was Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay in the political department. He could therefore claim to speak as an expert, and as one who had seen Indian affairs from the inside, and he was most firmly convinced, not only that the policy of aggression was not necessary, but that it was wholly mischievous, and he was prepared, therefore, to go with them heartily in any effort to get that great expenditure stopped in the interests of the millions both of this country and of India. (Cheers.)

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., who was received with cheers said he had not come there to quarrel with Lancashire, but to appeal to them as having their interests identical with those of India. He would first lay before them a few texts which would disclose the whole and true nature of the real condition of the Indian problem as it affects the true interests of the trade and industries of the British people. Macaulay said, as far back as 1833:—

"It would be on the most selfish view of the case far

better for us that the people of India were well governed and independent of us, than ill-governed and subject to us, —that they were ruled by their own kings but wearing our broad-cloth and working with our cutlery than that they were performing their *salaams* to English collectors, and English magistrates, but were too ignorant to value or too poor to buy English manufactures. . . . . That would indeed be a doting wisdom which in order that India might remain a dependency. . . . would keep a hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves."

The second text he wished to give was a few words of Mr. Bright, from his speech of 1858:—

"We must in future have India governed, not for a handful of Englishmen, not for that Civil service whose praises are so constantly sounded in this House. . . . you may govern India if you like for the good of England, but the good of England must come through the channels of the good of India. . . . There are but two modes of gaining anything by our connexion with India. The one is by plundering the people of India, and the other by trading with them. I prefer to do it by trading with them. But in order that England may become rich by trading with India, India itself must become rich."

The third text was a few words of Lord Salisbury in a minute:—

"The injury is exaggerated in the case of India where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As India must be bled. . . ."

And lastly he would, as somewhat further explanation of the preceding texts, give a few words of Sir George Wingate, on Financial Relations with India:

"With reference to its economic effects upon the condition of India. . . . taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in the effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former case the taxes collected from the population. . . . are again returned to the industrious classes. . . . But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they are raised. . . . They constitute . . . . an absolute loss and extraction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country . . . . might as well be thrown into the sea . . . . such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India. . . . . From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel crushing effect of the tribute upon India."

But (said Mr. Naoroji) even "in the former case" of taxes spent in India itself, a portion is consumed and enjoyed by an alien people, so that from the joint internal deprivation and external drain the people of India are afflicted with the triple evil of the loss of wealth, work, and wisdom. The Indian authorities, or Anglo-Indians, had kept up the policy, according to Macaulay, of making Indians slaves instead of customers; according to Bright, of plundering India instead of trading with it; according to Salisbury, of bleeding India; and, according to Wingate, of exacting a cruel, crushing tribute. The present system was simply the bleeding of India. To expect good trade with India as long as this policy was continued was simply ridiculous. There was a choice before the English people—whether India should remain in its present condition, impoverished and unable to buy English goods, or whether they would adopt a system by which India might become rich and by which England might become rich also. Here was a country, as Mr. Bright observed, of magnificent resources, and yet its people were miserably poor, and consequently not able to give us the trade that ought under fair circumstances to be ours. Under a wise policy the export trade of the produce of this country to India would be in excess of our total trade with all other parts of the world. The people of India were poor and lived poorly, not because they could not appreciate better things. Many of the Indian people were clothed in purple and gold when the natives of this island were wandering in their forests as savages. Their civilisation dated thousands of years before that of Britain. The people knew how to enjoy the good things of the world just as anyone in this country did. As matters now stood there was a constant bleeding of the country, and the end, it was to be feared, would be disaster. Lord Lawrence said the mass of the people lived on scanty substance, and the latest finance ministers declared the people to be extremely poor. Could there be a greater condemnation of the present system, that after a hundred years' rule of the most highly trumpeted and most exorbitantly paid Anglo-Indians the country was most miserably poor, and the blood of the destruction of millions and millions by famines lay upon our head? Our position in India depended not on our bayonets, but upon the contentment of the people. Bayonets might conquer an empire, but never would maintain one. It was only moral force, a sense of justice, satisfaction with the justice of British rule, that would enable us to keep our hold of India. If the people of India were wisely governed and freed from this constant drain on their resources they would become our best customers; our trade would increase to such an extent that we should be unable to supply the demands, and "unemployed" would be a word without meaning to us. (Hear, hear.) He appealed to the people of this country to consider these questions, to realise their gravity, and to devise a plan of better government. In that way by blessing the Indian people we should bless ourselves. (Cheers.) We were hankering after fresh markets, and killing negroes in thousands for that purpose; but if we would carry out a policy which would enable the people of India to buy our produce of an average of only £1 per head per annum, as compared with £7 or £8 in Australia, we should have a trade with India equal to that we had now with the whole world. (Applause.) At present the exports of British and Irish product to India was only 1s. 6d. or 2s. per head per annum of the population there, and a large portion of it was with the Native States, which had the administration of their own affairs. He asked them to say that the present system of administration must be thoroughly overhauled—(applause)—that they should cease to bleed Indians, and that instead of treating them as slaves, give them what was their birthright, the rights and privileges of British subjects—so repeatedly and so solemnly pledged to them for more than the past sixty years. (Applause.)

Mr. ARTHUR G. SYMONDS (Secretary of the National Reform Union) moved the following resolution:

"That this meeting, being convinced that the imposition of cotton duties in India is mainly due to excessive and increasing military expenditure beyond the frontier, urges Lancashire representatives in Parliament to strictly scrutinise this expenditure, and to press upon the Government the maintenance of a frontier policy which will secure the safety of the Indian Empire while economising the resources and giving contentment to the people of India."

After pointing out that the arguments for the resolution had already been fully and admirably stated in the speeches of Mr. Stanhope, Sir Wm. Wedderburn, and Mr. Naoroji, Mr. Symonds said that the reason why he took so much interest in India and its good government—apart from sound political principles which he believed were held by all true Radicals—was that he was born in India, where his father had lived for over thirty years, and where he still had near relations living. His earliest memories were of India, and he could still recall the piteous sight of some poor little native children whom he remembered to have seen in one of the villages—tiny naked brown skeletons—on the verge of starvation, as so many of the natives of India always were. In the name of our common humanity and in the name of Christianity, he appealed to Lancashire men and women to take an active interest in the condition and good government of their fellow-subjects in India, and to realise the great and sacred responsibility which the possession of that great dependency imposed on the people of this country. (Cheers.)

Mr. GORDON HEWART, who seconded the resolution, said that he had been invited to speak as a native of Lancashire, but the theory of some Anglo-Indian authorities appeared to be that no Lancashire man could possibly know anything of Indian affairs. Their theory was that the people of Lancashire, like the taxpayer in India, should pay the piper while a clique of officials called the tune. (Laughter.) That was not the view of the present audience. It was not the view of the gentlemen whose speeches they had just heard. It was not the view of the illustrious statesman whose statue stood not many yards away from that hall. Mr. John Bright said of India: "What you want is a new and a wiser and a broader policy, and that policy, I much fear, you will never have from the Government of Calcutta, until the people of England say that it is their policy and must be adopted." The purpose of that meeting, as he understood it, was to carry the case of the Indian taxpayer to the court of appeal—from the decision of servants who claimed the authority of masters to the tribunal

of the electorate. He hoped that the meeting would prove to be the predecessor of many similar meetings, and that their effect would be to arouse, not only in that county but throughout the country, a sympathetic and abiding interest in the affairs of their Indian fellow-subjects. (Cheers.)

The customary votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

The *Manchester Guardian* wrote on May 2nd:—The National Reform Union chose its time well for the meeting which was held yesterday in Manchester to discuss the civil and military expenditure of India. It is almost hopeless in ordinary times to try to interest large masses of Englishmen in Indian affairs. But two recent events have fixed the eyes of Lancashire people, at any rate, on that country. The Chitral adventure has struck everybody's imagination, and the re-imposition of the cotton duties has made Lancashire fear for part of her trade. These two events, closely connected, are an admirable starting-point for the inquiries which Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Naoroji last night asked their hearers to make for themselves. How comes it that cotton duties are required at all? In the first place, because—apart from the perennial currency difficulty—the Indian Government has adopted the policy of which the Chitral imbroglio was a typical result. The relief of Chitral, it is estimated, will cost India two millions sterling. And it is not an isolated piece of expenditure of the kind. Nearly thirty millions, unless we are mistaken, have been spent in the last fifteen years in carrying out the frontier policy of which the establishment of the Chitral agency was a part. That is to say, two millions a year, or the price of a serious border war, are regularly spent in changing the North-West Frontier. Now it might be wise for the English public which does not know India at first hand to acquiesce in this policy if it were unanimously approved by those who do know India well, and if these experts came forward as one man, or even if a large majority of them came forward, to tell us that the abandonment of this policy would threaten the security and prosperity of India, and that her Government could not lessen this terrible expenditure without exposing her to the risk of future losses more serious than the burden of the present expenditure itself. But there is no such unanimity. For every Anglo-Indian expert who publicly defends the "forward" policy another Anglo-Indian expert of equal competence comes forward to show that it is not only useless and burdensome but positively dangerous even from the point of view of Indian defence against possible Russian aggression. This is not a case in which English popular intervention would be a presumptuous setting up of the lay judgment against the judgment of experts. It is a case on which the experts have failed to agree, which they are all busily laying before the neutral public at home, and which it is the duty of the public to investigate and to decide.

The question put as simply as we can put it is this. It is assumed that Russia might at some future time wish to attack India on her North-West frontier. She is now separated from it by a vast tract of mountain and desert. It seems as if Nature had tasked her kindness and ingenuity to mark out our frontier with a great river bordered on our side of it by rich and easily traversed land, where communications are rapid, supplies plentiful, and administration almost positively remunerative, while the country beyond the river is in the main utterly barren, half covered with waterless deserts, and seamed and scarred with mountains, mountain torrents, and pestilential swamps. It was the feeling of Lawrence and till lately it was the feeling of all the greatest authorities on Indian defence, that India could have no surer protection than this that Nature had arranged. It seemed to them that we had simply to sit in readiness with our armies on the banks of the Indus, at Sukkur, at Mooltan, and at Rawal Pindi, and wait for such remnants of a hostile army as might dribble slowly out of the mountain defiles across the river after months of famine and dysentery and guerilla warfare with the tribes on their long route. This was Lawrence's policy. He felt that the further we went to meet Russia across the intervening desert the more would we decrease the difficulties of her own advance, lessening the distance over which she would have to march her armies to meet us, and increasing the distance between our own troops and their true base of operations. "I am convinced," he said in 1867, "that we can gain nothing, but are pretty sure to lose a great deal in prestige, in honour, in the valuable lives of our officers and soldiers by interfering actively in the affairs of Central Asia; and that, so far from strengthening our tenure of India, we may thus shake it to its very foundations. Nor am I insensible, I admit, to the financial aspects of the question. I know well what are the wants of India; how infinite are the material requirements of this country; how limited is the accumulation of capital; how obnoxious is every description of taxation to all classes of the people." The last consideration is not merely a consideration of compassion for the Indian taxpayer. It is all-important from the point of view of military defence. For if ever Russia should dream of attacking India with an army which, she must know, would be decimated by the hardships of the approach, it would be with the hope that the presence of even such an army would raise native India in revolt against the British Government. The spectacle of a contented India would put such hopes out of the question. And India can only be contented when she is not unduly taxed. Every annual contribution of two million sterling by the population of India to the cost of little wars and expeditions beyond her frontier weakens the fund of goodwill and loyalty on which our defence would rest even more surely than on a scientific frontier in the case of a foreign attack. So that by this policy of frontier extension we certainly weaken the Indian Empire in one respect, and we probably weaken it in every other. Our moral hold on the country is weakened; our physical wall of defence is, in the opinion of half the best authorities, broken down. In late years this policy has had the upper hand. We spent two and a quarter millions to occupy Quetta, a step which Lawrence declared "unnecessary and impolitic" when it was proposed to him. Every year now, in spite of the protests of soldiers like Sir Neville Chamberlain, we are spending almost as much in fresh advances which are gradually covering with military roads, telegraphs and depôts of supplies the waste in which an invading army would have been starved and worn to pieces if it had attempted to cross it when we had left it unreclaimed.

One falls almost insensibly into the way of saying that "we" are spending this money—one hears so often in this country heroic protestations that whatever may happen "we" must defend India to "our" last shilling, and the like. The only shillings that we ever spent or are likely to spend on the defence of India were in the exceptional contribution of £5,000,000 which Mr. Gladstone made from British taxes towards the expenses of the last Afghan war. As a rule, India pays, and will continue to pay, for every breach of the Lawrence policy which is committed by her Government. Not only that, but she pays, under the head of "Home Charges," a heavy contribution towards the expenses of the army at home. Under the present system the whole cost of the home depôts of British regiments serving in India—and these constitute no small part of the garrisons in Great Britain and Ireland—are charged on the Indian revenues. As Lord Northbrook said, "every single farthing of the British soldier's expenses from the time he recruits until the time he goes out is paid by India." Where a soldier's period of service is partly devoted to the defence of this country and partly to the defence of India, India pays for the whole. The same spirit is shown in the arrangements for the maintenance of the India Office in London. We did not venture to ask the Colonies to build the Colonial Office or to pay the annual charges of its establishment. But we built the India Office, at six times as great a cost out of Indian revenues, and every penny of its annual cost comes from the same purse. It is only a small item among many large ones; but, as an example of the practice of laying on the Indian Budget every possible charge that can be shifted from our own shoulders, it may be mentioned that when the Ministry of the day wished to give the Sultan of Turkey an imposing reception in London, the India Office then just completed, was used for the purpose, and the bill of £10,000 for the expenses of the party was sent in to the taxpayers of India.

ANGLO-INDIANS AND THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., has appended to his minute of dissent from the report of the majority of his colleagues on the opium traffic the following Memorandum on the attitude of the authorities in India:—

1. While in India I was obliged to express dis-

approval of the action of the Government of India and of various officials in relation to the Commission. As the after proceedings did not remove but strengthened this objection, it is due to the Commission and myself to place the main grounds of this objection on record.

In doing so I readily acknowledge the difficult position of the Indian authorities. Rightly or wrongly, they appeared to hold in the main that the good government of India is bound up with the opium revenue. The difficulties arose from assuming an impartiality on the part of the Indian authorities which could not be, and was not, continuously enforced.

2. Some of the circumstances to which I am about to refer were stated in a letter addressed by me to Lord Brassey while we were in India, but the consideration given to them appeared to me inadequate. I have here omitted some and added others.

3. On the 18th November, 1893, it transpired that a telegram had been sent from the Government of India to the Secretary of State on the 15th August, containing the following passage: "We shall be prepared to suggest non-official witnesses, who will give independent evidence, but we cannot undertake to specially search for witnesses who will give evidence against opium. We presume this will be done by the Anti-Opium Society." As anti-opium evidence was easily available, without any special search, this official statement seemed to show that the authorities were taking up a partisan attitude.

4. Two days later a letter from Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, to Lord Brassey, Chairman of the Commission, was passed round to the members for perusal. It contained a statement in favour of the existing opium system, and against interference with that system as likely to lead to serious trouble. This appeared to me a departure from the judicial attitude which might have been expected from Her Majesty's Representative.

5. The Government of Madras was not allowed to present its own case to the Commission, but was instructed by the Government of India (13th December, 1893,) to send to Calcutta abstracts of evidence of proposed witnesses. A letter of similar purport was addressed on the same day to the Resident at Haidarabad with regard to the evidence of other witnesses. Similar instructions were given to the Government of the North-West Provinces. I submit that this requirement was distinctly detrimental to the free expression of opinion and unprecedented in the history of Royal Commissions.

6. An official letter was sent (30th December, 1893) from the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh, to all Commissioners of Divisions, and other officials in these provinces, calling attention to the fact that some officials had "communicated direct with the Secretary of the Commission, submitting to that officer abstracts of the evidence," and pointing out "that there is no authority for this procedure, and . . . . that all communications should be addressed to this Government." Here, again, the authorities seemed determined that no evidence should be submitted to the Commission which had not been subjected to official scrutiny in high quarters. Moreover, this circular was not communicated to officials alone, but even to non-official persons who were intending, and were considered qualified, to give evidence on the subject of the inquiry.

7. At Benares, Mr. Isan Chandra Roy, M.B., stated that he had been officially invited to be a witness and to furnish an abstract of his intended evidence. After he forwarded his statement, he was informed by official letter, in which no reason was assigned, that his evidence was not required. The fact that he entertained anti-opium opinions was subsequently proved by his volunteered evidence before the Commission. Other proposed witnesses at Benares were similarly treated.

8. At Bankipur, a list of witnesses intended to be called on the 3rd January was supplied to me. It included the name of Rai Bahadur Jai Prakash Lal, C.I.E., Dewan of Dumraon. This gentleman represents a large estate in which poppy is extensively cultivated. He was not called. Information from two sources led me to believe that his evidence would not have been altogether favourable to the Government. The official version of this circumstance will be found in Vol. V., p. 355, paragraphs 4 to 10, and as I have commented on it in the Appendix to my dissent from the Report of the majority of the Commission, I will only add a strong expression of my opinion that as the Dewan was not called on the 3rd January, the Commission ought to have been informed that he was present on the 6th January. The withholding of that information was not creditable to those concerned.

9. At Lucknow twenty-four witnesses were called at the instance of the Government, twenty-three of whom gave evidence generally favourable to the Government case. Thinking that a different kind of evidence might have been omitted, Mr. R. M. Dane, who accompanied the Commission to manage the case on behalf of the Government of India, was, at my request, asked by Lord Brassey to put in the list of persons who had been asked by the authorities to give evidence at Lucknow, together with such abstracts of their evidence as had not already been produced. I thought the Commission was entitled to know the method that had been followed in making the selection of witnesses, and that the original list of witnesses, with the marks and notes upon it, would throw light on the subject. The list was not produced. It was stated that the names of Lucknow witnesses were included in the general list of all the witnesses for the North-West Provinces and Oudh; but that circumstance seems quite irrelevant, and an altogether insufficient reason. However, the names of seventeen rejected witnesses extracted from the list were supplied, together with the abstracts of evidence of sixteen, four of whom seem to entertain anti-opium views, and four others make some strong observations against the use of opium. I would draw particular attention to the fact that two of these gentlemen, namely, Mr. P. Wyndham, C.S., Assistant Commissioner and Excise Officer, Sultánpur, and Mirza Muhammad Beg, Deputy Collector of Basti, make the important statement that in their opinion revenue and rents derived from land would not be sensibly affected by the prohibition of poppy cultivation.

10. At Bombay another instance of the anxiety of the authorities to prevent the free communication of information on the opium question was brought to light by the Rev. A. W. Prautch. An official circular had been issued desiring that information applied for by Mr. Ernest Hart, Chairman of the British Medical Association, should not be replied to, on the ground that "to reply to such applications might prove embarrassing."

11. I learned at Bankipur that the police at Gaya had been searching out the movements of two of my friends and myself for the purpose of ascertaining with what persons we had had communication. As this matter formed the subject of protest on my part before the Commission, I need only refer to the Minutes of Evidence. I do not know whether on any other occasion we were similarly tracked.

12. Perhaps the most notable instance of the Government method of preparing for the fair and honest inquiry expected in England will be found in the correspondence relating to the Native States of Rajputana. On the 9th September, 1893, the Government of India directed the agent of the Governor-General in Rajputana to invite the durbars of the Native States to appoint witnesses to give evidence before the Commission, and also to nominate a British officer to give evidence as to those States. An abstract of his evidence was, as in other cases, to be forwarded to the Government of India. Accordingly, on the 22nd September the agent, Colonel G. H. Trevor, sent out a circular "to all political officers in Rajputana," desiring that the durbars [courts] of the Native States should be invited to nominate witnesses, and requesting the British officers addressed to furnish information and statistics. On the 5th October Lieut.-Colonel Abbott was appointed to give evidence himself, as well as to produce the witnesses, and arrange the evidence from the Native States—the request for a draft of his evidence being again repeated by the Government of India. Colonel Abbott then prepared a note on opium, which will repay careful perusal. He indicated the principal heads of evidence, and, among other things, suggested "that some stalwart Sondhia, Mewati, and Rajput lumberdars and patels should be among the witnesses selected." He made numerous other suggestions as to matters of detail entirely in favour of the existing state of things, and without any provision for ascertaining and proving any matters of an adverse character, either of fact or of opinion. He advised that the witnesses "should reach Ajmere a week in advance" of the Commission, and supplied the reason, namely, "that I may become acquainted with all, and see if each one understands on what points he is required to give evidence." He also made careful suggestions for preparing ample claims for compensation. On the 29th November "all political officers" were again addressed on the subject as follows: "Mr. R. M. Dane, C.S., the officer selected by the Government of India to advise local administrations in the matter of preparing for the inquiry to be held by the Opium Commission, has had an opportunity of seeing the previous correspondence on that subject in this office, and has pointed out that the great importance of the inquiry . . . has apparently not been fully appreciated . . . . that Rajputana is vitally interested in the inquiry," and that "there should be no lack of evidence, both official and non-official, to prove before the Commission the full extent of their rights and interests in opium." The suggestion was repeated that witnesses were, if practicable, to be "ready in Ajmere about a week in advance of the Commission's arrival there." Taken altogether, this correspondence is, in my opinion, as one-sided as the instructions in a brief in a partisan cause, and the evidence, which in accordance with these suggestions, was prepared and put before the Commission at Ajmere, was of an unusually partial and one-sided character.

13. The instances I have given as to the action of the authorities appear to me inconsistent with any real desire on their part that the whole of the facts should come in a perfectly unbiassed manner before the world. Whatever the Government of India intended by their determination not to seek for evidence of an anti-opium character, its action was likely to be understood, and was undoubtedly understood, to mean that pro-opium evidence was to be sought for, and anti-opium evidence was not.

14. Lord Brassey himself had early recognised the true position of the Government, as is clear from his statement to Mr. Alexander, the secretary of the Anti-Opium Society, at the close of his evidence before the Commission: "We all appreciate that in the encounter in which you are engaged with the Government of India upon its own ground you are placed in circumstances of no ordinary difficulty."

15. My contention on this subject is, that having regard to the nature of British authority in India and to the moral timidity of many residents in India, both Native and European, it was the duty of the Government, in the presentation of evidence to be adduced before the Commission, to have publicly assured the people generally that no harm would come to them by giving free expression to their views, however opposed such views might be to the interests of the revenue, or the known predilection of English officials. In fact, it should have given practical effect to Mr. Westland's message read by the chairman at the commencement of the proceedings on the 27th December: "The Government, however, will not reply to such evidence [that is anti-opium evidence] as a defendant, but will merely pursue their course of enabling the Commission to fully ascertain the actual facts."

16. In view of the various incidents which came to my knowledge, and some of which are here set forth, I am driven to the conclusion that the authorities in India have not pursued their declared "course of enabling the Commission to fully ascertain the actual facts."

Reviews.

INDIAN SCENES.

Among the Gods. Scenes of India: with Legends by the Way. By Augusta Klein. (William Blackwood and Son. 1895.)

This is a very pleasantly written account of a journey through India, occupying the months from

November, 1891, to the spring of the following year. The same travellers have already been introduced to the public, for their doings in Palestine were chronicled in the pages of *Blackwood's Magazine.* "There is Irene, the tender-hearted, Philippa the business-like, and Sebaste, who gathers much wool in the course of every day." The trio play their parts throughout the book. The scraps of exact information are offered by Philippa. Sebaste, the scribe, is prone to somewhat metaphysical vagaries. Irene acts the part of an amiable background. They touched first at Ceylon, and spent some days there. At that season of the year Ceylon presents its most delightful aspect. "Truly it is an alluring land, an enchanted island just risen in freshness and beauty from the depths of the shining sea." Here, as elsewhere, in their travels, they are chiefly interested in the temples, and Ceylon recalls many Buddhist legends which are touched upon. At the approach of Christmas they crossed to Southern India, hoping to spend Christmas Day at the mission station of Nazareth. But they were unable to reach this point till a few days later. Some particulars are given of the work done by the missions in Southern India, so far as these are carried on by the Anglican Church. Most interesting, perhaps, is this mission at Nazareth, where educational and medical work supplements more strictly evangelical undertakings. At Trichinopoli the Principal of the College gave, among other details, an amusing story descriptive of the plays which are frequently acted by the students.

> "With regard to costume, the students have the most original ideas; chiefly they are convinced of the necessity (for whatsoever character) of a modern English suit, a walking stick, and a pair of well blacked English boots. We had 'King John,' which went off very well indeed, except for a somewhat disconcerting catastrophe at the beginning of the fourth act. Hubert and his attendant villains had never worn boots before. The consequence was that when they simultaneously rushed on the stage (each flourishing his inevitable walking-stick) they all three suddenly tumbled down together."

Here the travellers visit also the great pagoda, which is dedicated to Krishna the Preserver. This is the largest pagoda in India, covering more than 163 acres, and containing among other things the Hall of the Thousand Columns. Their visit to Madras calls forth the legend concerning the martyrdom of S. Thomas, the saint whose name is connected by history, and far more closely by tradition, with the earliest attempts to Christianise India. Through Calcutta, which scarcely gets its share of attention, the travellers pass on to the magnificent mountain scenery of Darjiling. Afterwards they come to the holy city of Benares and the sacred waters of the Ganges.

> "All the religious energy of Benares has for its heart and its centre the bank of the Ganges. Thither move for ever processions innumerable. Sometimes it is a wedding train; sometimes a moaning chant fills the air as the funeral of some pious Hindu creeps onward to the burning ghat, whence the ashes of the departed will be carried away by the holy waters, and his soul fly straight to a fabled heaven."

Among the many other places described are the Pool of Immortality and the Golden Temple at Amritsar. There is a short account of Nanak, the founder of the Sikh religion, and of the Gurus who followed him. The aim of the book is merely to offer a description of the various parts of India. Hindu mythology is far too complicated a matter to be more than touched upon in what does not profess to be a learned treatise. But the stories from the Mahabharata and other books of the East are well chosen, and add much to the attractiveness of the volume. It contains also twenty-two full page illustrations, which are excellent reproductions of photographs.

"CHIPS," LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY.

Chips from a German Workshop. By F. MAX MULLER, K.M., Foreign Member of the French Institute. New Edition. Vol. III.: Essays on Language and Literature. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

In this third bundle of "Chips," Professor Max Müller gives three parts to Language and two parts to Literature, the literature being mainly German, with dashes of French and English. If the fine essay on Schiller, which stands first, had been placed with the other literary sketches, the two departments would have been completely separated, each compact. Practically, however, this matters nothing at all. Those of us who take a genuine interest in the subjects discussed will find no difficulty in laying their hand on any particular "chip" when they may want it.

There is a certain homogeneity in the main part at least of the linguistic essays in the present volume. The Rede Lecture of 1868 at Cambridge is devoted to an exposition of the Stratification of Language. The Rede Lecture of 1875 deals with the Chronology of Language. The inaugural lecture which the author delivered as Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford appraises the value of that subject as a branch of academic study. The inaugural lecture he delivered before the Imperial University of Strassburg in 1872 estimates the results of the science of Language. These four lectures together represent concisely the drift of the author's general views on the main aspects of linguistic study. There is much interest also in a number of special notes appended to the Oxford and Strassburg lectures, discussing particular points of importance, mainly grammatical. A short paper on "Spelling Reform in France," dated 1893, is supplementary to a general article on "Spelling," dated 1876.

The Professor always sets forth his views in luminous language and skilfully marshals his illustrations to enforce them. There is an air of ease and polish that implies mastery and confidence. However it might be wished that passages should be rewritten here and there from a later standpoint, still the Professor does not find any essential necessity for modification in the main lines of his contention. The reason is to be found, less in lack of openness of mind, chiefly in the thoroughness of of his work before he gave the results to the scholarly public. As the linguistic essays stand, they are striking landmarks in the progress of a great study, indicating, among other things, the

driving force applied by the author himself. It seems strange that so lately as 1868 Professor Max Müller should have been setting before him, as the chief object of the lecture on the Stratification of Language, "to call attention to a fact that had not been noticed before, namely, that there is hardly any language which is not at the same time isolating, combinatory, and inflectional." It is pleasant to watch with what friendly courtesy he breaks a lance with Professor Curtius over the attempt of the latter "to establish seven distinct chronological periods in the history of the Aryan speech previous to its separation into Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Slavonic, Teutonic, and Celtic." It is inspiring to note with what lofty and steady confidence he maintains the value and assesses the results of his favourite science. On occasion, too, Professor Max Müller can be wisely and suggestively discursive; as where he points out the easy reforms that would open up a career in England for scholars and students—reforms that have been more or less nibbled at in recent years—or where he illustrates the observation that he knows of "no life more perfect than that of a German professor in a German school or university." Through every scientific lesson is felt the pulsation of a large human heart as well as the light of a penetrating mind.

There is much wider scope for the expression of moral judgments and varied feeling in the essays on Literature. We have already referred to the sketch of the "Life of Schiller." A mere sketch it is, no doubt; but Professor Max Müller takes care to select for comment just those influences that determined the direction of the poet's genius at different periods of his career. Now and again, too, we find a large generalisation worthy to be treasured. Thus: "The lives of great men are the lives of martyrs; we cannot regard them as examples to follow, but rather as types of human excellence to study and admire." Again: "Schiller was too great a man to be ambitious." Professor Max Müller told his compatriots in the Strassburg lecture that though he had lived long abroad and pitched his tent for nearly twenty-five years—it is nearly twenty-five years more since 1872—on English soil, yet he had always remained German in heart and mind. Almost necessarily so; and no sensible man will quarrel with the fact or the statement. And cogent evidence will be seen throughout these essays, for the Professor rises to his highest enthusiasm in contemplation of the master works in the literature of the Fatherland. With this feeling it is easy for us to sympathise. For, as he himself remarks epigrammatically, "there is no country where so much interest is taken in the literature of Germany as in England, and there is no country where the literature of England is so much appreciated as in Germany." His article on "German Literature," together with the chronological collection of extracts from the fourth to the nineteenth century to which it was originally prefixed, undoubtedly aided the tendency of English students to study German literature before the times of Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe—in consonance with the similar tendency towards the ancient treasures of English literature. We have advanced a considerable distance in these studies since that essay was written; but though we have altered the facts somewhat, the spirit of the essay has not yet spent its influence, and the lucid and judicious survey will richly repay a careful reading. It is to be noted, too, that Professor Max Müller keeps well in view the whole mental life of the nation, for his "German Classics," as he points out in his rapid survey of German Literature, "if properly used, can be read as a running commentary on the political and social history of Germany." How keenly sympathetic is the essay on the old Minnesänger, who sang of Faith, Love, and Honour!

"We are awed by the presence of those tall and silent knights, with their hands folded and their legs crossed, as we see them reposing in full armour on the tombs of our cathedrals. And yet, however different in all other respects, these men, if they once lift their steel bearer and unbuckle their rich armour, are wonderfully like ourselves. Let us read the poetry, which they either wrote themselves, to which they liked to listen in their castles on the Rhine or under their tents in Palestine, and we find it is poetry which a Tennyson or a Moore, a Goethe or a Heine, might have written. . . . . It is modern poetry—poetry unknown to the ancient world, and who invented it nobody can tell. It is sometimes called romantic, but this is a strange misnomer. . . . It is Teutonic poetry—purely Teutonic in its heart and soul, thought its utterance, its rhyme and metre, its grace and imagery, show the marks of a warmer clime. It is called sentimental poetry. . . . . It is subjective as distinguished from objective poetry. . . . . It is Gothic, as contrasted with classical poetry. . . . . But all these are but names, and their true meaning must be discovered in the works of art themselves, and in the history of the times which produced the artists, the poets, and their ideals. . . . . Most of the poems of the Minnesänger are sad rather than joyful—joyful in sorrow, sorrowful in joy. . . . . There is simplicity about these old songs, a want of effort, an entire absence of any attempt to please or to surprise and we listen to them as we listen to a friend who tells us his suffering in broken and homely words, and whose truthful prose appeals to our heart more strongly than the most elaborate poetry of a Lamartine or a Heine."

The essay on Sebastian Brant's famous "Narrenschiff," or "Ye Schippe of Fooles," is well worth permanent record; and the paper on "The Language and Poetry of Schleswig-Holstein" formed a very interesting addition to English knowledge of that country at the date of the troubles over the Schleswig-Holstein question, and is of permanent value. The Professor illustrates by charming examples the exception made by Klaus Groth to the still further exceptionable proverb, "Holstein singt nicht." The essay concludes with a most touching and simply heroic episode of the luckless Danish War of 1863. There is much that is curious and suggestive in the papers on "Joinville," "The 'Journal des Savants' and the 'Journal de Trévoux'," "Chasot," and "A German Traveller in England, A.D. 1568" (Paul Hentzner). There is also a worthy tribute to "Shakespeare," delivered at the Tercentenary proceedings at Stratford-on-Avon in 1864 by Professor Max Müller as the representative of Frankfort, the birth-place of Goethe. The final essay, on "Bacon in Germany," summarises the argument of the well-known volume of the distinguished Professor Kuno Fischer. The third volume of the new edition of "Chips" is thus seen to be full of important and suggestive matter, ably and charmingly presented.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 4. JUNE, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debate on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from April 30th to May 24th.

Imperial Parliament.

April 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

The final Report of the Commissioners was presented, namely: Vol. VI. (Part I.—Report, with annexures); Vol. VII. (Part II.—Historical Appendices, with index of witnesses and subjects, and glossary of Indian terms).

May 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORT OF THE HEMP DRUGS COMMISSION.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that the Report of the Hemp Drugs Commission, appointed by the Government of India in consequence of action taken in this House, was, as long ago as August of last year, distributed to the *Times of India*, the *Pioneer*, and the *Englishman*:

Could he state on what date the Report was published in India, and on what date copies were received at the India Office:

If he was aware that the honourable member for Bradford, on whose initiative the Commission was appointed, applied to the India Office for a copy of the Report on 22nd September, 1894, three weeks after it had been reviewed by the Anglo-Indian press, and had made repeated applications since, but only received a copy last Saturday:

If it was possible for this Report to be procured by the general public:

And if it was intended to distribute it to Members of this House, and place a copy, with the volumes of evidence, in the Library of this House.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: My answer to the first of my hon. friend's questions is in the negative. I do not know when the Report was published in India, but the orders of the Government of India on the Report were published on the 23rd March last. An advance copy of the Report alone reached me on the 14th November last, I cannot verify the precise dates, though I am aware that repeated applications for the Report were made by my hon. friend; but it did not appear to me to be desirable to make its contents known until I could at the same time communicate the orders of the Government of India, which did not reach me until the 5th April. The Report cannot, so far as I am aware, be obtained in this country; but I shall be happy to lay it on the Table, with the orders of the Government of India, if the hon. member will move for them.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a speech delivered by Lord Elgin in the Viceregal Council early last month, in which he admitted that the Government of India foresaw that if anything happened to Nizam-ul-Mulk, the ruler of Chitral, the position of any British officer who might be then in Chitral would be one of extreme danger:

Would he explain why Lieutenant Gurdon was nevertheless allowed to visit that place in mid-winter with an escort of only ten men:

Whether he had observed from the published reports that the British Political Officer, Mr. Robertson, wrote to Lieutenant Gurdon on 8th January ordering him not to make his way back with his men owing to the badness of the road between Chitral and Mastuj, although, at the same time, Mr. Robertson was able successfully to send forward another fifty men to join him by the same road:

Whether he had observed that Lord Elgin in his speech justified the sending forward of the fifty men on the ground that it was essential that Lieutenant Gurdon should be either supported or relieved:

Could he explain why, instead of relieving and withdrawing Lieutenant Gurdon from Chitral, the Government of India ordered Mr. Robertson to follow him there; and what was their object in doing so:

And whether, in regard to the points above noticed, the Government of India had acted on their own responsibility, or whether they had had the consent of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The statements (1 to 4) extracted by the hon. member from the Viceroy's speech in Council are correct, save that the fifty men referred to were ordered up from Mastuj by Lieutenant Gurdon himself, being part of his own escort, not sent forward by Dr. Robertson.

As was explained to the House on the 21st March, in answer to a question of the hon. member for Banffshire, the Government of India had been asked by Amir-ul-Mulk to recognise him as Mehtar, and they ordered Dr. Robertson to enquire and report as to the propriety of doing so.

The Government of India in this matter acted, as is usual and proper, on their own initiative and responsibility.

Dr. MACGREGOR: Arising out of that answer, while I admire he heroism of my fellow countrymen in Chitral, I would ask the right hon. gentleman can he state to the House what business we have in Chitral at all, and what right we have invading a territory against the will of the natives, and putting them to death in defence of their homes?

Mr. H. FOWLER: I should like to correct a statement of the hon. member. We have not invaded a territory. We are rescuing the representatives of the Queen and people of Great Britain who have been attacked. (Cheers.) The whole policy of the future relations between this country and Chitral is a matter that is now engaging the most anxious attention of

Her Majesty's Government, and when they have fully considered the policy they think best it will be announced to the House. (Cheers.)

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN CHITRAL.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of the fact that the present ruler of Chitral, Amir-ul-Mulk, secured his present position by murdering his brother, it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to support Amir-ul-Mulk as ruler of Chitral.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The question of the policy to be pursued in Chitral is under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS. PETITIONERS SAID TO HAVE BEEN FINED.

Mr. NAOROJI asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would inquire whether, in Gujrat (Punjab), in May or June last year, Nawab Mohomad Afzul Khan, Deputy Commissioner, fined several teachers of the board school for signing a petition to the House of Commons in favour of simultaneous examinations:

And, whether he would take steps to prevent a recurrence of such conduct.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have no information on the subject of my hon. friend's question, but I will make enquiry.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could now indicate when a decision on the grievances of the Indian Staff Corps might be expected.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The Secretary of State for War after consultation with the Commander-in-Chief, has informed me that he is unable to concur in the recommendation of the Government of India with respect to an alteration in the rules of promotion of officers of the Staff Corps. It has, therefore, been decided that no change shall be made in the present rules.

Majors and Captains of the Staff Corps permanently appointed Commandants and Seconds-in-Command of Native Regiments will be given a step of temporary rank.

THE PROPOSED POLICE BILL.

Mr. THOMAS OWEN asked the Secretary of State for India, if his attention had been called to the dangers likely to arise in administering the proposed Police Bill for the prohibition of solicitation in public places in India, a draft of which appeared in the *Gazette of India* of 23 January, 1895:

And whether he had advised the Government in India to give to the Bill very careful consideration before its final enactment.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have seen the letter referred to by my hon. friend.

The Penal Code provides for the punishment of any breach of the rules laid down by Government.

THE INDIAN CANTONMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS OWEN asked the Secretary of State for India, if his attention had been called to an article published in the *Times of India* of 13th March, 1895, over the signature, "A Married Officer," showing that there was a strong movement in the Indian Army for acting contrary to the Resolution of the House of Commons and the recent legislation in India for the Amendment of the Cantonments Acts:

And, if he would state what provisions the recent legislation made for the prevention of violations of the purpose of its enactment.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The dangers likely to arise were pointed out by members of the Bengal Council who have been added to the Select Committee appointed to revise the provisions of the Bill. I have no doubt that the Bill will receive most careful consideration and I have not thought it necessary to issue any special instructions on the subject.

May 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN CANTONMENTS.

On the Motion of Mr. Stansfeld an address was granted for Copies or Extracts from recent correspondence between the India Office and the Government of India on the subject of the Cantonment Acts and Regulations.

STRENGTH OF THE BRITISH ARMY IN INDIA.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, what was the established strength of the British Army in India:

By what statute or ordinance was it regulated:

Why was there excess over established strength of the British Army in India in the financial year 1894-5:

And, whether such excess was legal.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The established strength of the British Army in India is 73,168 officers and men. It is not regulated by any statute or ordinance.

There was a slight excess during part of the year 1894-5 owing to the drafts sent out to meet the loss by death, invaliding and other causes between the end of one trooping season and the beginning of the next.

The excess is legal.

BRITISH SOLDIERS AND INDIAN REVENUES.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India under what statute was the application of the revenues of India to the maintenance of a British Army in India provided for:

Whether there was any provision for spending the revenues of India upon any excess over the established strength of the British army:

And whether the application of Rx. 35,000 to meet this excess, as shown in paragraph 27 of the Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1895-6, was legal.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The application of the revenues of India to the maintenance of a British army in India is not governed by statute other than the general statutory provision which places the expenditure of Indian revenues for Indian purposes under the control of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The payment of the charge for the slight excess over the established strength of the army during a part of 1894-5 was quite legal.

THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the red line shown on the sketch map of the north-west frontier of the Punjab, at page 91 of Part IV. of the Statement of the Progress and Condition of India for the year 1859-60, represents the north-west frontier of British India from the Lehree Boundary Pillar on the south to Hazara and the Kunhar River on the north in 1860.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have no doubt that the sketch map of 1860 to which the hon. member refers was drawn with due care at that date and upon the information then available, but I am not in a position to answer for its correctness.

THE ANNUAL EXODUS TO SIMLA.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India how much had been spent up to the present time on Government buildings and offices at Simla:

How much additional expense was thrown upon the Revenues of India by the annual removal of the seat of Government from Calcutta to Simla, and by the cost of communications and the transport of supplies to and from Simla, a distance of nearly 1,200 miles:

And under what heads was the cost of this removal of the seat of Government, direct and indirect, shown in the accounts of the Government of India.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: (1) The expenditure on the Government buildings and offices at Simla has been about Rx. 790,000.

(2) The extra annual cost incurred by the transfer of the Government to Simla and back was shown as Rx. 72,415 in 1883-4, in Parliamentary Paper 17 (Sess. 2) of 1886. But in 1889 fresh rules were made, by which the allowances were reduced by Rx. 12,600, so that the gross cost is now about Rx. 60,000. But, as explained in that paper, there are receipts to the extent of about Rx. 20,000, which may be set against this. No "supplies" are transported at the public expense, in consequence of the move to Simla during the summer.

(3) The allowances given to the several departments on account of the move are, in the accounts, included in the pay, etc., of those departments, and are not shown separately. They were given in the foregoing return for five years under each department.

Mr. CAYZER asked whether it was not necessary, on grounds of health for European officials, to move to Simla in the hot season?

Mr. H. FOWLER said that that had been the opinion of successive Viceroys.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Dr. MACGREGOR asked the Secretary of State for India, if he would consider the propriety of recognising the heroic conduct of Dr. Robertson in defending Chitral, and also of Dr. Whitchurch who, while carrying a wounded officer off the field, had to fight his way back to the fort at the point of the bayonet.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I can assure my hon. friend that I in common with every member of this House enthusiastically admire the brilliant heroism of the defence and of the relief of Chitral. When I am in a position to submit to her Majesty the names recommended for special marks of her favour I shall not overlook the distinguished claims of Dr. Robertson and Dr. Whitchurch.

May 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PREMATURE DISCLOSURE OF THE OPIUM REPORT.

MR. FOWLER "GREATLY REGRETS" THE OCCURRENCE.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS asked the Secretary of State for India, at what date Mr. J. A. Baines, the Secretary of the Commission on Opium, prematurely communicated the Report of the Commission to a particular newspaper, in the columns of which a summary of the Report appeared on 22nd April:

Whether, on more than one occasion during April, the latest being on the 22nd, Mr. Baines wrote to the representative of a press organisation saying information as to the Report should be given to the press as soon as he was at liberty to do so:

And, when Members of this House might expect to be in possession of the Report.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE: Before the right hon. gentleman answers, I should like to ask him whether he is aware that the members of the Commission resident in this country did not receive their copies of the Report until a week after it appeared in the daily papers?

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I am unable to answer the question of the hon. baronet, but I may say that I have only myself received this morning my own complete copy of the Report. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Nottinghamshire, the Secretary of the Opium Commission understood that the Report would be laid on the Table of the House on Monday the 22nd April, and on Saturday the 20th he communicated the Report to a member of the press who stated that he represented several newspapers. It was not until the morning of the 22nd that Mr. Baines learnt that the Report would not be presented until the 25th. I have already stated I greatly regret this occurrence.

The answer to the second question is in the affirmative.

The Report was circulated on Saturday last.

Mr. WEBB asked the Secretary of State for India, whether any further official notice would be taken of the action of the Secretary of the Opium Commission in prematurely disclosing a copy of the Report.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I do not propose to take any further action in this matter.

May 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A SEVERE SENTENCE.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been directed to the report of a sentence of five years' rigorous imprisonment inflicted by the Sessions Judge at Howrah upon a prisoner charged before him with stealing a few vegetables from a field; and, if so, would he call for an inquiry into the truth of the report.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have not seen any report of such a case, but I am informed that the man must have been an habitual offender, or he would not have been committed to the Sessions. Every sentence passed by a Sessions Court is reported to the High Court, and the High Court can revise it either of its own motion or upon petition by the person sentenced.

If my hon. friend will supply me with the facts of this case, I will consider whether further inquiry should be made.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state approximately the strength of the military escorts and supports available in any case of emergency for the protection of the British political officers in the Native States of Haidarabad, Mysore, Indore, and Gwalior:

What was the strength of the military escorts and supports possessed by the British political officers at Gilghit and Chitral respectively before the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk, the ruler of Chitral, by his brother on 1st January last:

When did Nizam-ul-Mulk succeed to the throne, and what happened to his predecessor:

And for how long a period had a British political officer been in Chitral before the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I do not consider it to be in the public interest to answer the first question of the hon. member.

At the date of the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk the whole force under the Gilghit command numbered about 3,000 men, of whom 100 represented the escort of the assistant political officer in Chitral whose station was at Mastuj. Besides his escort of 100 men, there were 700 men distributed on the route between Gilghit and Mastuj.

Nizam-ul-Mulk became Mehtar in November, 1892, after deposing his uncle Sher Afzul.

A British political officer was sent to Chitral at the end of 1892 at the request of the then Mehtar, Nizam-ul-Mulk, and has been maintained in Chitral since.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was the intention of the Government to recommend that the inquiry into Indian affairs should take place before a Parliamentary Committee or Royal Commission:

And, if the latter, what opportunity would be afforded to the House to discuss the terms of reference to be made to the said Royal Commission.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: No inquiry into Indian affairs has been proposed by her Majesty's Government. On the contrary I distinctly refused to be a party to any such inquiry. It is proposed that the inquiry into Indian Expenditure should be conducted by a Royal Commission. It is not usual to discuss in this House the terms of a reference to a Royal Commission.

THE FRONTIERS OF BRITISH INDIA.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would place upon the Table of the House a sketch map showing by a red line the present external frontiers of British India upon the west and north-west so far as known and indicating wherein the present external frontiers differ from those existing in 1860.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I will consult the Government of India as to the preparation of such a sketch map as is referred to by the hon. baronet.

INDIAN ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that much discontent exists among the officers of the Indian Army owing to their frequent supersession by officers of several years' shorter service from the British Army, and the consequent ruin of their professional prospects:

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I am not aware that the officers of the Indian Army are superseded by officers of several years shorter service from the British Army. With respect to the Rules of Promotion in the Indian Staff Corps I, on the second of this month, replied to a question by the hon. member for Hull.

RAILWAY EXTENSION IN CEYLON.

Mr. Caine asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if the attention of the Secretary of State had been called to the demand for further railway extension in Ceylon; and had he considered the desirability of encouraging the construction of railways and feeding lines of tramways by private enterprise in that colony; and, if so, would he instruct the Government of Ceylon to afford encouragement and grant facilities to those who might be desirous of promoting and constructing such lines.

Mr. Sydney Buxton: The Government of Ceylon has shown great enterprise in extending the railway system of the colony, and there seems therefore no occasion to send any special instructions to them on the subject. Any well-considered scheme which may be brought to the notice of the Secretary of State will, of course, receive attention.

May 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CONVEYANCE OF RAILS TO CALCUTTA.

Sir George Baden-Powell asked the Secretary of State for India whether a contract for conveying to Calcutta 11,000 tons of Middlesborough rails had been given to the German "Hansa" Line of steamers, for the reason that the German tender was 6d. per ton lower than any English tender, making a total difference on the contract of £275:

Whether he was aware that in the case of loss by collison by fault of the captain the only redress against a German ship was recovery of the sunken wreck, whereas a British shipowner would be liable up to £8 per ton register:

Whether the matter of insurance had hitherto been considered of such importance by the Secretary of State for India that he had refused shipowners the benefit of the negligence clause:

And, whether he could state what steps had been taken in this case to insure the said rails, and at what cost.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: No contract for conveying rails to Calcutta has been entered into on behalf of the Secretary of State for India with any foreign firm; the shipment of Government stores being confined to vessels sailing under the British flag. In cases where the manufacturer undertakes to deliver goods in Calcutta at his own risk, he of course chooses his own means of conveyance.

RULES UNDER THE CANTONMENTS ACTS.

Sir Andrew Scoble asked the Secretary of State for India, if he would agree to the Motion for a Copy of the Rules made under the Indian Cantonments Act.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have already agreed to a motion by the right hon. member for Halifax in compliance with which a copy of the rules made under the Indian Cantonments Act will be laid on the Table of the House.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.
UMRA KHAN AND THE AMIR.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the news had been confirmed that Umra Khan had been interned by the Amír of Afghanistan, and would he be handed over to the Indian Government:

Whether this Umra Khan was the chief of the same name who in 1891-2 was engaged in raiding on the territories of the Amír in the districts around Asmar:

Whether, on that occasion, when the Amír's commanders proposed to make reprisals, His Highness was warned by the Indian Government against doing so, on the ground that Umra Khan's territory was outside the sphere of influence of Afghanistan:

Could he state to the House the terms of the ultimatum which was recently sent to Umra Khan by the Indian Government, and was it received by him before the British troops crossed the British frontier on 2nd April:

And, could he also give the terms of the proclamation by the Indian Government to the surrounding tribes.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have no official confirmation of the statement that Umra Khan has been interned by the Amír and will be handed over to the Indian Government. My answer to the second and third clauses of the hon. member's question is in the affirmative: but Asmar was not occupied by the Afghans at the time referred to. The terms of the ultimatum and of the proclamation will be included among the papers to be presented to Parliament, but I am not yet in a position to say when the presentation may take place.

The proclamation of the Indian Government has already been published in the press.

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL LIST.

Sir Richard Temple asked the Secretary of State for India with reference to the Officers of the General List Indian Army, in view of a collective promise with reference to promotion and pension made to all Indian Officers, including the cadet who entered the Service up to 1861, that is to say, the Officers now complaining of unequal treatment, by a Despatch of Sir Charles Wood, then Secretary of State, published to the Indian Army as G.G.O. 632, of 4th August, 1864, would he explain whether the assurances "promotion through every grade with the pay thereunto belonging," and the right to Indian pension maintained, include the grade of Colonel with Colonel's allowances, mentioned in paragraph 81.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The passage in the order of 1864 quoted by the hon. member refers to the prospects of promotion and pension under the rules then in force, including the succession to the Colonel's allowance, but, as regards the Officers who entered the Service since 1858, this promise is subject to any change that might be introduced into the Service.

HIGHLANDERS AT RAWAL PINDI.

Mr Rentoul asked the Secretary of State for War, whether his attention had been called to a statement that the Gordon Highlanders stationed at Rawal Pindi were, in general, Presbyterian in religion, and that they were without a Presbyterian chaplain;

And, whether this was a fact; and, if so, whether a Presbyterian chaplain would be appointed.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I will inquire into the facts of this case as to which I have at present no information except that, according to the returns, rather more than half the Gordon Highlanders are Presbyterians.

May 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Sir W. Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state what amount of breech-loading rifles, and what amount of amunition, had from time to time been given by the Government of India to successive Mehtars of Chitral; what amount to Umra Khan; and what amount Umra Khan was allowed by the Government of India to purchase in India:

With what object the rifles and ammunition were given; and whether they had been used against our troops during the recent fighting in Chitral:

Whether the statement made by Captain Younghusband at a meeting of the Geographical Society, as reported in the *Times* of the 25th March last, to the effect that "Nizam-ul-Mulk started from Gilghit with the support of Colonel Durand, and with that was able to turn out Sher Afzul," was correct; if so, what offence had Sher Afzul given the Government of India at that time so as to justify our Agent in supporting against him another pretender to the Mehtarship of Chitral;

Whether Colonel Durand acted in this matter under the orders of the Government of India, and whether such action was consistent with the policy of recognising the *de facto* ruler of Chitral:

Whether at the forcing of the Malakand Pass about 500 Swat tribesmen were killed, and about 1,500 wounded:

Whether the Swat tribes live in independent territory:

Whether the Government of India had any right, by treaty or prescription, to march troops through that territory:

And, whether on this occasion the Swat tribes had agreed to troops being marched through their territory; and, if not, for what offence the losses above referred to were inflicted on them.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: My hon. friend has put to me fifteen separate questions dealing with the policy and details of the recent Chitral relief expedition. In due course papers relating to that expedition will be laid upon the Table of the House; but in the meantime it is impossible to give by means of question and answer a history of the circumstances connected with these operations.

EMPIRE OF INDIA EXHIBITION.

Mr. KEIR-HARDIE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to a forthcoming exhibition in London called the Empire of India Exhibition:

Whether he was aware that several Native Indian Princes had received applications to send over Indian workpeople and various Indian treasures to the exhibition; and that those applications bore the imprint of names of various Indian officials (retired or otherwise):

And, whether he would take immediate steps to inform the Indian Princes concerned that there was no Governmental connection with this exhibition.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I am aware that an Indian exhibition is being prepared, but I have no information regarding applications to Indian Princes, such as are described in the hon. member's question. It was announced in the *Bombay Gazette* of the 7th February, 1895, that "the exhibition was a purely private adventure, the Government of India having decided to take no part in it."

I do not propose to take any steps in the matter: I believe that Indian Princes are not likely to be misled as to the facts of the case.

BRITISH-INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked the under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention had been called to a statement in the *Johannesburg Times* of February 1, to the effect that a field-cornet of the name of Bodenstein had forcibly expelled certain British subjects from the town of Krugersdorp on the on the ground that they were Asiatics; whether the persons expelled were British subjects and natives of India; and whether the law of the Boer Republic permitted the expulsion of British subjects from Boer territory on no other ground than that of their nationality; and, if so, whether the Sikh soldiers and policemen now being enlisted under the authority of the Crown for service in South Africa were liable to be subjected to a similar indignity in case they crossed the Boer frontier.

Mr. BUXTON: We have not yet received the report of the High Commissioner on the statement in question, which was referred to him a few weeks ago. The legal position of British-Indian subjects in the Transvaal being open to doubt, the question was lately referred to arbitration, and we have only just received the report of the arbitrator. As regards the Sikh soldiers in Nyasaland referred to by the hon. gentleman, I do not think it probable that any question will arise in regard to them, as the frontier of the South African Republic is at least 500 miles from the place where they will be stationed.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked whether there was any precedent for making distinctions of this kind between British subjects in accordance with the colour of their skins.

Mr. BUXTON asked for notice of the question.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was within his recollection that a pledge was given by him to the House on 15th August last that, if the hon. member for Flintshire would withdraw his Motion for an inquiry into the condition of the people of India, the right hon. gentleman would undertake, on the part of the Government, that at the very commencement of the present Session they would propose the appointment of a Select Committee which would inquire into the financial expenditure of the Indian revenues, both in England and in India, and also a pledge that it would be open to any member of the House, when the Motion for the appointment of the Committee was made, to submit any amendment he thought necessary in regard to the terms of the reference to be made to such Committee:

And, whether, with a view to implement these pledges, Her Majesty's Government would give an opportunity to members of this House to discuss the terms of the reference to the Royal Commission which had been appointed as a substitute for the Select Committee originally offered to the House by the Government on 15th August last.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: It is quite true that in August last I did promise an inquiry into the expenditure of the Indian revenues, both in England and in India, and, as I intimated then, I thought that such an inquiry should be conducted through the instrumentality of a Parliamentary Committee. I also stated—but I gave no pledge—that, of course, any hon. member could move an amendment upon any Motion made in this House. But in the debate upon the Address this Session the whole question was discussed again, and I then explained to the House the objection that had been raised to the constitution of a Parliamentary Committee to deal with this subject—namely, that such a Committee would be confined to members of Parliament, and that other gentlemen who were specially qualified to deal with the question, who were in fact experts, would be excluded. Another objection taken was that, in the not improbable contingency of an early dissolution of Parliament, a Parliamentary Committee would come to an end, and its labours would be rendered futile. Therefore I stated that it was desirable to conduct the inquiry by Royal Commission, and I gathered that the view which I then took was endorsed by the general sense of the House. My colleagues and myself, therefore, came to the conclusion that a Royal Commission would be the best mode of inquiry, and yesterday the names appeared in the newspapers of those gentlemen whom her Majesty has been pleased to approve of as constituting that Commission. I have endeavoured to constitute the Commission as fairly and impartially as possible, and every section of opinion interested in Indian finance is represented upon it. It is not in harmony with the usual practice of this House to discuss the terms of the reference to a Royal Commission.

May 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH AMMUNITION IN CHITRAL.

Colonel HOWARD VINCENT asked the Secretary of State for India if there was any truth in the report that large quantities of British Government arms and ammunition had been found in the possession of the enemy in Chitral:

And, in such case, if he would direct a most searching inquiry to be instituted as to how they were obtained, with a view to the adoption of prompt legislative or other steps in conjunction with other departments to prevent the possibility of the recurrence of a state of affairs so prejudicial to British interests.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have as yet no complete information on the subject to which the hon. member's question refers: but I have no doubt the Government of India are investigating the matter, and the hon. member may rely upon its receiving due attention.

TRANSFER OF RAILWAY STOCKS.

Mr. BARTLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in the transfer of some of the Indian Guaranteed Railway Stocks the Companies required a certificate of burial in the case of the death of one of the holders, and would not accept a certificate of death:

Whether he was aware that this often involved great difficulty and delay:

And, whether he would consider the advisability of altering this requirement in future.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The Indian Guaranteed Railway Companies are administered by their respective Boards of Directors. I have ascertained that though the procedure followed by each of the Companies varies somewhat in detail, the general practice is to accept either certificates of death or of burial.

THE CASE OF MR. KUNHI KANNAN.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been directed to the case of Mr. Kunhi Kannan, deputy collector and magistrate of Calicut, in the Madras Presidency, who was some years ago tried, convicted, and imprisoned on a charge of having taken a bribe from an accused person whom he had tried in his capacity as magistrate:

Whether he was aware that the conviction of Mr. Kunhi Kannan rested almost entirely on the evidence of this accused person, who swore that he had had to call in a certain sum which was due to him on a mortgage, which sum he had handed over to Mr. Kunhi Kannan:

Whether he was aware that since Mr. Kunhi Kannan's conviction evidence had been forthcoming, in the shape of proceedings in a court of law, which proved that the sum which was due on the mortgage had not been called in, and therefore could not possibly have been paid to Mr. Kunhi Kannan:

Whether he was aware that the Madras Government, on whose prosecution he was convicted, had refused to grant any inquiry into this case, or any redress for the wrongful conviction to which he declared that he could prove he had been subjected:

And, whether Her Majesty's Government would take any steps to secure that an opportunity be afforded to Mr. Kunhi Kannan to establish his innocence.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: In consequence of a question put by my hon. friend the member for East Bradford last year this case was fully considered, and I have nothing to add to the reply which I gave on the 2nd April, 1894.

THE MAHARAJA OF BHARTPUR.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received the report called for from the Government of India regarding the alleged setting aside of the Máhárája of Bhartpur from the government of his State:

Whether he was aware that the present Máhárája only ascended the throne on the death of his father about fourteen months ago; and that the Government of India notified that the British Resident would conduct the government for a period of twelve months:

And, could he state the grounds on which the Máhárája had been set aside.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: My reply to the 1st and 2nd questions of the hon. member is in the affirmative. As to the 3rd question, the Government of India were satisfied of the incapacity of the Máhárája to discharge his duties as Ruler of the State and I have officially approved of their action.

LEAVE AND PENSION RULES.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether a despatch was sent home in January last, conveying the recommendations of the Indian Government on the subject of leave and pension rules for the European officials (non-civilian) in the Indian Service:

And when a decision might be expected.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Such a despatch was received, and a reply was sent on the 11th of April giving the Secretary of State's decision on most of the points mentioned; but in a few cases the Government of India were asked to reconsider their proposals.

GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether, when the Government of India became entitled some years ago to purchase the Great Indian Peninsular Railway, the Bombay and Baroda Railway, and other railways in the West of India, they waived that right for a period of years; and, if so, what was the yearly loss now to the revenues of India due to such waiver:

What consideration did the railway companies give for the concession, and what gain was now accruing to the revenues of India from the consideration given by the railway companies:

And, whether he would lay the whole correspondence upon the Table of the House.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: In 1870, the Secretary of State relinquished his right to purchase on the first opportunity and modified the contracts of the companies in the circumstances described in paragraph 8 of the Railway Report for 1869-70 by the Government Director of Indian Railway Companies.

I cannot say what has been the pecuniary advantage or disadvantage of the modifications of the contracts, as I do not know what would have been the price at which the railways could have been purchased by Government under the terms of the original contracts.

Correspondence on the subject was presented to the House in 1879.

INDIAN CADETS.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had considered the case of the survivors of sixteen candidates who passed into Addiscombe at the first examination, held in December 1859, under paragraph 17 of the regulations for admission for cadet-ships in the Engineers and Artillery of Her Majesty's Indian Forces under Clause 34 of the Acts of 21 and 22 Vic., chap. 166:

Whether, after being sworn in as Indian Cadets, they were after the decision was taken to amalgamate the Services, sent for and informed by Sir Frederick Abbott, the Governor of Addiscombe, that it was not proposed to appoint any more Officers to the Indian Artillery and Engineers, but that these cadets would retain all their rights and not be losers by the change, and by a similar promise, when they joined at Woolwich as Commissioned Officers, were induced to volunteer for general service, and in fact were appointed to and served in India, and were furthermore paid the £100 promised to those who obtained Commissions in the Artillery and Engineers of the Indian Forces, by the regulations under which they were examined for cadet-ships, and were in effect treated as if they had passed into the Indian Service:

And whether, as one of the four surviving Officers concerned had recently been retired upon a pension of £450 a year, instead of the Indian pension to which he was entitled, it was proposed to adopt the same course with the remaining three Officers concerned:

And, if so, on what ground the engagement entered into with these gentlemen by the Indian Government was now annulled.

Mr. Woodall: These Officers entered as students at Addiscombe with the expectation of joining the Indian Artillery or Engineers; but before their college course was finished, appointments to those corps had ceased, in consequence of the transfer of the Indian Government to the Crown; and as the only military opening available they joined the Royal Engineers. The Officers were never in the Indian Corps; and I regret to say that their claim to be treated for pension as if they had been in those corps cannot be recognised. There is no record of any authority having been given to the Governor of Addiscombe to hold out any such promise to the Cadets, as is referred to in the hon. members question.

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. Arnold-Forster asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it was the fact that peaceable British subjects, natives of India, were liable to be expelled without trial from the Transvaal; and, if so, what was the crime alleged or disqualification on account of which these British subjects were punished; and whether the Government would take steps to make public in India the fact that natives entering the Transvaal were liable to expulsion without trial and with violence by subordinate military officers in the employment of the Boer Government, so that intending emigrants might not be exposed to unnecessary indignities.

Mr. Sydney Buxton: The hon. member is mistaken in supposing that British Indian subjects can be expelled without trial from the Transvaal. The Government does not propose to take the steps suggested in the second part of the question.

Mr. Arnold-Forster, pressing for a further answer,

Mr. Sydney Buxton explained that the dispute had been referred to arbitration. The report of the arbitrator had only just been received, and there had not been time to consider it.

Mr. Arnold-Forster: The hon. gentleman has four times declined to give an answer. Can he tell us what were the alleged grounds upon which these British subjects were deprived of the opportunity of earning their own living?

Mr. Sydney Buxton: The complaint against them was the infringement of certain local sanitary laws. I have not refused in any case to answer the hon. member. I have always informed him that an arbitrator was inquiring into the dispute, and we wished to see what the arbitrator said.

May 17th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

Lord Stanley of Alderley asked her Majesty's Govern-

ment whether, in consideration of the protection given to cotton duties, they would take a similar step on behalf of the silk industry by placing duties on foreign silk stuffs imported into England.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY: said that the premisses on which the noble lord based his demand had no foundation whatever. There was no protection of cotton goods in India, to which he supposed the noble lord referred. The line was drawn at a certain number of counts, after careful consideration. It was drawn at the point where an excise duty was necessary for countervailing the duty laid on cotton goods. Power was reserved to the Government of India to alter the line if it were found wrong; but at present the Government did not think that it was so drawn as to give protection to cotton goods. He supposed the noble lord would expect him to use some commonplace with regard to free trade. All he could say was that this country was at present under a system founded on what was generally termed "free trade," and the Government had not the slightest intention of considering in any manner whether that system should be abandoned for the purpose of putting a protective duty on the silk industry.

May 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MILITARY STORES FOR INDIA.

Mr. HANBURY asked the Secretary of State for India, what Military stores were manufactured in India, and in what cases the stores manufactured in India formed the total supply of that kind for the British forces in that country:

Whether those stores included cordite; and, if not, when it was expected to commence the manufacture of that powder:

And, in what cases, a system of simultaneous tenders for Military stores in England and in India was adopted.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Speaking generally all Military Stores that can be satisfactorily and economically manufactured in India are obtained in that country: but it is impossible to give a list of the stores which are wholly provided in this way.

Cordite has not yet been made in India and the question of its manufacture there is under consideration.

No system of simultaneous tenders for Military stores has been adopted.

Mr. HANBURY asked how long it was since the plant for the manufacture of cordite was actually sent out, and whether the delay was due to any want of confidence as to the ability of Indian manufacturers to manufacture cordite.

Mr. FOWLER: No, Sir, the question is entirely one of climate whether cordite can be safely manufactured in India.

May 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXPENDITURE ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table of the House a short Statement, or Return, showing the capital expenditure on Government buildings for the accommodation of Viceroys, Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Chief Commissioners, and Agents of the Governor General in India during the last ten years, giving the amount spent in each province separately, with a brief note of the reasons for incurring the expenditure.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The detailed information asked for by the hon. member is not available either in the Public Works or Finance Departments of the India Office.

It could only be supplied after reference to India.

THE REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether a Supplement to the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium, containing the Memorandum of the Máháraja of Durbhanga, would be in the hands of members before the Debate took place on Friday next.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The Memorandum will be presented to-day, and I understand that it will be distributed to hon. members on Wednesday next.

May 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DELHI-SAMASATA RAILWAY.

Sir JAMES KITSON asked the Secretary for India, whether he had arrived at any decision on the proposals for the construction of the Delhi-Samasata Railway, the tenders for which were submitted last year; and, if not, would he state when a decision would be come to, in order that the existing favourable conditions of finance and favourable markets for materials might be taken advantage of in the interests of India.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: Revised tenders for the construction of the Delhi-Samasata railway are now before the Secretary of State in Council, and I have every reason to think that a decision on them will be arrived at early next week.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that much dissatisfaction exists among the Officers of the Indian Staff Corps, owing to the fact that the rate of promotion was much more rapid in the British than in the Indian regiments serving in India, the consequence being that Officers of more years and experience in the Staff Corps constantly found themselves commanded by British Officers of much shorter service:

Whether the rates of promotion for the Staff Corps were orginally fixed with express reference to the British rates of promotion, and had remained so fixed, although the British rates had been accelerated:

Whether he was aware that the grievances arising from different rates of promotion among Officers serving side by side was recognised as long ago as 26th May, 1858, when the Court of Directors, writing to Lord Ellenborough, described them as injurious supersessions, and again in 1864, when they were described in G. G. O., No. 632, as extensive supersessions of Officers:

And, whether he would personally examine the question, and endeavour to make such alterations in the rules regarding promotion as would put an end to the grievance complained of.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: On the 2nd May I answered a question of the hon. member for Hull with respect to the alleged grievances of the Indian Staff Corps. In reply to the present question I can only say that I have considered the matter, and that having consulted the Secretary of State for War and the Commander-in-Chief, I am unable, in view of the opinions which they have expressed, to make any change in the present rules for the promotion in the Staff Corps.

May 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BALLADHUN MAGISTRATE AGAIN.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India, if his attention had been called to an official inquiry into the complaint of Taran Chunder Bose *v.* Aijuddy and others held at Faridpur and reported in the Indian journals of 24th April:

Was he aware that it was stated in the official report that the said Taran Chunder Bose charged Aijuddy and two others with robbery before the deputy magistrate, who submitted to the district magistrate that the evidence justified a prosecution; that the District Magistrate not only refused to prosecute Aijuddy and his accomplices, but ordered that Taran Chunder Bose should be prosecuted under section 211, I.P.C., for instituting a false case; that, on application to the High Court by Taran Chunder Bose, this order was not only set aside, but the District Magistrate was ordered to send up Aijuddy and his fellow robbers for trial at the Sessions; that eventually the persons accused of robbery were all convicted, and the conviction was upheld by the High Court on appeal:

And, whether in view of the fact that the district magistrate who refused to prosecute was the same gentleman who as District Magistrate at Balladhun was severely censured by the Calcutta High Court, and afterwards by the Viceroy in Council, for his conduct in the Balladhun murder case, he proposed to take any action in the matter.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: My attention has not been called to this case, but my hon. friend has favoured me with an extract from the newspaper on which he relies.

I am not in a position to say whether the statements contained in that newspaper are correct, but I will refer the allegations to the Government of India who are the proper authority to deal with matters of this description.

FUTURE POLICY IN CHITRAL.

Mr. CURZON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Her Majesty's Government had arrived at any decision concerning the future administration of Chitral, and concerning the steps that might be required for the safeguarding of British interests in that quarter, and of the lines of communication with British India; and, if so, whether he could state such decision to the House.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The matters to which the hon. member's question refers are receiving the most careful attention of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. W. REDMOND: I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether it is true that the late ruler of Chitral has been sent to India, and, if so, whether it is proposed to keep him in India, or what the Government are going to do with him?

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have no information on that point except what has appeared in the newspapers.

May 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN CADETS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for War whether, in 1859, Sir Frederick Abbott, who was Governor of Addiscombe College, was the representative of the East India Company in dealing with the students of the college; and, if not, whom he represented:

Whether, in 1859, a batch of sixteen students went to Addiscombe under the terms of a Royal Warrant which promised them, subject to passing through the Addiscombe course, to receive commissions in the Indian artillery and engineers:

Whether, before their college course was finished, appointments to those corps had ceased, in consequence of the transfer of the Indian Government to the Crown:

Whether, as a consequence of that cessation, it was or was not actually decided by the Government of the day to deprive these gentlemen of the benefit of the promises under which they had been induced to compete for their cadetships:

Whether, in point of fact, the then governor of Addiscombe, Sir Frederick Abbott, promised these students that the inducements held out to them to enter the college for the East India Company's service would be fulfilled by the Government of India:

Whether, in consequence of this promise, they agreed to go into the Royal Artillery and Engineers, and whether the promise was subsequently confirmed at Woolwich:

If he was aware that the gentlemen in question were prepared to make an affidavit to this effect:

Whether, on proof of such promise having been made, the Indian Government were prepared to repudiate an undertaking of the responsible authorities at Addiscombe and Woolwich:

And whether the rights of these gentlemen were protected under the Henley clause of the Government of India Act.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The officers in question went to Addiscombe in 1859, not under any Royal Warrant, but under the conditions of appointment laid down by the Secretary of State for India. Those conditions contemplated appointment to Indian artillery or engineers; but under an Act of 1860 appointments to those corps were stopped, and the only alternatives were to cancel the nominations altogether, or to appoint the cadets to commissions in the Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers. The gentlemen who accepted the latter alternative were never officers of the Indian army, and do not come under the Henley clause in the Act of 1858. There is no record of any promise as to pension being made to them; nor had Sir F. Abbott, as Governor of Addiscombe College, which was maintained in 1859 by the Government of India, any power to give a pledge as to future prospects to officers who did not enter the local forces.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for War, whether cadets from Addiscombe, who were appointed to the Imperial Cavalry and Infantry, viz., to the 19th, 20th, and 21st Hussars, and to Regiments 101st and upwards, at the same time or subsequently to the 16 cadets of 1859, who were induced to join the Royal Engineers and Artillery from Addiscombe by the promises of Sir Frederick Abbott, received, or would receive, Indian pensions, although the latter were deprived of them; and, if so, on what grounds a distinction was made against the Engineers and Artillery.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No officers were appointed direct from Addiscombe Military College to the Imperial cavalry and infantry; but some officers, who had been at Addiscombe in 1859-60, joined the new line regiments from the general list of the Indian army; and, in common with other officers appointed from that army, were allowed prospective pensions under Indian regulations. The distinction between these officers—who were certainly very fortunate—and their contemporaries who joined the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers is that the former did join the Indian army and the latter did not.